

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01779316 7

101

THE REIGN OF
HENRY THE FIFTH

Cambridge University Press
Fetter Lane, London

New York

Bombay, Calcutta, Madras

Toronto

Macmillan

Tokyo

Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha

All rights reserved

836r

THE REIGN OF HENRY THE FIFTH

BY

JAMES HAMILTON WYLIE, M.A., Litt.D.

LATE H.M. DIVISIONAL INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS
FORD'S LECTURER IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, 1899

AND

WILLIAM TEMPLETON WAUGH, M.A., F.R.S.C.

KINGSFORD PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN
McGILL UNIVERSITY

VOLUME III

(1415-1422)

Cambridge
at the University Press

1929

238011
29. 11. 29.

3

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

PREFACE

WHEN Dr J. H. Wylie died, early in 1914, he had completed the first volume of his *Reign of Henry V* and had corrected 96 pages of proof for the second. He left a great mass of manuscript, and much of this, thanks to the courageous devotion of members of his family, was printed in vol. II, which appeared in 1919. But a good deal still remained unpublished, and as the editors of vol. II felt unable to continue their work, this eventually came into my hands. After discussion with Dr Wylie's publishers, it was agreed that I should prepare it for the press, and that, in order to complete the work, I should myself deal with such phases of the subject as Dr Wylie had not touched. It was stipulated that I should omit such parts of the manuscript as were not strictly relevant to the main theme and that the appendices, in particular, should be severely compressed.

The manuscript entrusted to me contained a narrative beginning with the departure of the Emperor Sigismund from Constance in July, 1415, and ending with the capitulation of Melun in November, 1420. On the greater part of the period covered Dr Wylie had apparently completed his researches. Very little of the manuscript, however, had undergone literary revision. Dr Wylie's style, it is true, was somewhat unconventional, and it would have been unpardonable to amend it according to text-book rules of English composition; but his draft abounded with colloquialisms and solecisms, which he would certainly not have wished to be printed under his name. Consequently, while the matter of chapters xlviiii–lxi is substantially his, the form is partially mine, though I have kept his exact words whenever it was possible. Here and there I have corrected palpable slips; sometimes I have drawn attention to the results of research conducted since Dr Wylie's death; and I have inserted one or two passages on topics to which he had given little or no attention. Whenever I could do so without bewildering the reader, I have enclosed my own

contributions in square brackets. It will of course be understood that I have not tried to verify all Dr Wylie's references; for to do this would have been to repeat research on which he had spent many years. In point of fact, however, I have collated much of the manuscript with his original authorities.

After chapter lxi Dr Wylie's manuscript degenerated in both matter and style, evidently representing a comparatively early stage of his work on the topics concerned. Chapters lxii–lxv are thus almost as much mine as his, though I have based them on his researches as far as I could and have tried to give expression to his opinions on the subjects treated, even when I did not wholly agree.

At the end of chapter lxv Dr Wylie's manuscript failed me. For chapters lxvi–lxxv I alone am responsible.

The Appendices have caused me much perplexity. Some seventy were promised in vols. I and II. For most of them the manuscript in my hands contained no material whatever or none that could be used; and in many cases I failed to discover what kind of information Dr Wylie had intended to supply. Whenever his notes for appendices contained something that seemed interesting and valuable, I tried to use it; and I have myself written two appendices on subjects which seemed to call for special treatment. But it would have been absurd to concoct appendices which to me seemed unnecessary and which would doubtless have been quite different from those which Dr Wylie had in mind. I hope that this explanation will mitigate the disappointment of any readers who may have been led by vols. I and II into expecting a long series of original essays on a variety of recondite subjects.

The compilation of the bibliography presented many difficulties. It of course includes not only works cited in the notes of this volume, but also those cited in vols. I and II. Dr Wylie left a catalogue of books he had used; but though very long, it was not exhaustive, and his curt method of referring to sources sometimes made it very hard to identify a work omitted from his list, or, if the work could be ascertained, the particular edition which had been employed. Despite resolute investigation, I have to confess myself beaten by a few of his references.

My task has proved harder and taken much longer than I expected when I undertook it. This is due partly to my own faulty estimate of its character, but partly to obstacles and inter-

ruptions which I could not have foreseen. I need hardly say that the work would never have been completed at all but for the assistance which I have received from many quarters. To name all who have helped me would make this preface unduly long. A few, however, must not be passed over without a special tribute of thanks. By reading my proofs, Dr James Tait, once my teacher, later my colleague, always my friend, has placed at my service his unsurpassed knowledge of mediaeval history. It was at the instance of Dr T. F. Tout that I was given the opportunity of undertaking the work, and I am particularly gratified that he has written for this volume a short memoir of Dr Wylie, whom he knew well. I also owe much to the kindly help of another former colleague, Professor F. M. Powicke. My friends Mr V. H. Galbraith and Mr A. P. R. Coulborn have saved me time and trouble by transcribing documents in the Public Record Office and the British Museum. I have to thank Major Algar Howard, Windsor Herald, for his courtesy and kindness in promoting my researches at the College of Arms; and I am greatly indebted to M. le Maire of Bauge for his readiness to furnish information to a stranger. To Miss Constance Harvey, of the administrative staff of McGill University, I am grateful for valuable help. During the past years I have of course worked in many libraries, public and academic; and I have nearly always found that those whose duty it was to aid me have interpreted that duty in the most generous spirit. While reluctant to make distinctions, I cannot forbear mentioning the Library of Harvard University, where visiting scholars are welcomed, assisted, and trusted with a liberality which immensely increases the advantages derived from access to the Library's splendid resources.

From beginning to end my wife has been my constant helper, crowning her manifold contributions to this work by compiling an exceptionally troublesome index.

I cannot withhold an acknowledgment of the patience and consideration with which I have been treated by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press and its successive Secretaries. Nor should I conclude my task without testifying to its effect in confirming the admiration and respect which I have long felt for the distinguished scholar with whom, though I did not know him in life, I have had the honour to collaborate. Every page of his manuscript bears witness to his indefatigable in-

dustry in research, his unquenchable thirst for knowledge, and his unswerving zeal for historical truth. He was, it should be remembered, an amateur in the best sense of that honourable though much abused designation. The work which this volume completes was, in the words of the preface to vol. II, "the sole occupation of his leisure and the last thing in his thoughts when he died." What he would think of this volume I dare not surmise, but I am glad to have been the means of preserving from loss some of the fruits of his devoted labours.

W. T. W.

MONTREAL, QUE.

October 28, 1928

CONTENTS

		PAGE
	MEMOIR by T. F. Tout, D.Litt., F.B.A. . . .	xi
	CHAPTER	
XLVIII	SIGISMUND IN FRANCE	1
XLIX	SIGISMUND AND HENRY	9
L	HENRY'S SECOND EXPEDITION: PREPARA- TIONS	36
LI	HENRY'S SECOND EXPEDITION: NORMANDY INVADED	50
LII	CONQUEST IN LOWER NORMANDY	65
LIII	CIVIL STRIFE IN FRANCE	77
LIV	THE FATE OF OLDCASTLE	85
LV	ABORTIVE DIPLOMACY	97
LVI	THE CONQUEST OF LOWER NORMANDY COM- PLETED	107
LVII	THE SIEGE OF ROUEN	118
LVIII	ROUEN IN ENGLISH HANDS	143
LIX	FURTHER BARGAINING	150
LX	THE CONFERENCE OF MEULAN	161
LXI	DIPLOMATIC FAILURE AND MILITARY suc- CESS	171
LXII	THE DUKE OF BURGUNDY'S SKULL	184
LXIII	THE TREATY OF TROYES	196
LXIV	THE DAUPHINIST RESISTANCE	207
LXV	THREE YEARS IN ENGLAND	219

CHAPTER	PAGE
LXVI HENRY IN PARIS	224
LXVII NORMANDY, 1420-1422	235
LXVIII HENRY'S LAST VISIT TO ENGLAND	265
LXIX BAUGÉ	293
LXX THE ANGLO-BURGUNDIAN RECOVERY	311
LXXI MEAUX	337
LXXII THE INDEFATIGABLE DIPLOMATIST	358
LXXIII THE REGENT OF FRANCE	378
LXXIV THE CLOSE OF THE REIGN IN ENGLAND	393
LXXV "IN MANUS TUAS, DOMINE"	406
APPENDICES A-Z ²	427
LIST OF PRINTED BOOKS TO WHICH REFER- ENCE IS MADE	449
LIST OF MANUSCRIPT AUTHORITIES USED	536
INDEX	538

MEMOIR

By T. F. TOUT, D.LITT., F.B.A.

MY friendship with Wylie goes back to 1890, the year in which I settled in Manchester. I had already made great use of his first volume of the *History of Henry IV* because it had fallen to my lot to write the life of that King for the *Dictionary of National Biography*. I well remember the occasion on which I first met him personally. It happened that I took down the proofs of my article to the Chetham Library to verify some references. There I found Wylie at work and we soon got into conversation. He was immensely interested in my errand, asked to see my proofs, made a few suggestions about them and did not in the least mind the rather guarded commendation which my bibliography bestowed on his first volume. It is no great distance from Manchester to Rochdale and our interest in mediaeval history, and membership of the same Oxford College, brought us so closely together that we remained great friends until the end. He even robbed himself of hours normally devoted to Lancastrian history in a hopeless attempt to teach me the elements of golf. But I learnt a great deal from him historically, and shall ever cherish the memory of his kindness, devotion and learning, and shrewd sense. I gladly pay what tribute I can to his memory.

James Hamilton Wylie was born in London on 8 June, 1844. He was educated at Christ's Hospital, whence he went with a scholarship to Pembroke College, Oxford, where he obtained a first class in classical moderations and a second in Literae Humaniores, graduating B.A. in 1868 and M.A. a few years later. He was subsequently an assistant master at Trinity College, Glensalmond, resigning in 1874 when he was appointed an Inspector of Schools. In the same year he married Miss Agnes Maclaren.

The Inspectorate claimed Wylie for the next thirty-five years. It was a time when inspectors of schools were less frequently moved about than in these later days and he was stationed at Rochdale between 1877 and 1895. Thence he was transferred to the Welsh March, residing successively at Shrewsbury and

Hereford. In 1901 he was moved to London where he had charge of a large district in the East End. In 1906 he was promoted to be Divisional Inspector in the North Eastern Counties, and shifted his quarters to Bradford without giving up his house in Hampstead. On his retirement in 1909, he settled down at Hampstead until his death on 28 Feb. 1914. Mrs Wylie, two sons and two daughters still survive him.

Wylie was a good inspector, conscientiously discharging all his official work, zealous in promoting educational developments and taking a kindly interest in the schools and their teachers within his district. Though never pushing himself forward, he played a not unimportant part in the local concerns of his neighbourhood. It was largely on his advice that the surplus of a subscription for the erection of a statue to John Bright in Rochdale was devoted to the establishment of a small fellowship for the study of English Literature at Manchester University. Yet generally he restricted his non-official activities as far as possible. Even before he entered the service of the Education Office, he had taken up a lifelong task from which he seldom allowed himself to be diverted. This was the writing with minute care and from the best sources the detailed history of England from the accession of Henry IV onwards. It was difficult enough to put together such a work "during," as he said, "the broken intervals of a busy official life, often at a distance from original sources of information." It could only be done by utilising every scrap of leisure, and by concentrating himself on it with rare self-devotion. He reduced his social obligations to a minimum, and his holidays to what was necessary for the health of a young family. By twelve years of self-denial and by the strictest control of his leisure hours, he was able to publish his first volume.

What circumstances led Wylie to become the historian of fifteenth century England it is hard to say. His historical education at Oxford had not brought him nearer to the Middle Ages than the early Roman Empire, and there is little evidence of the motives that turned his interests into this particular channel. There is a family legend to the effect that, when still a schoolmaster in Scotland, he entered into an agreement to write a chapter upon Henry IV in a little elementary history book. He gradually got so interested in his task that the little book was forgotten and he had stumbled accidentally into his life's

work. It was lucky that his appointment to Rochdale in 1877 put the venerable Chetham Library at Manchester within easy distance of his home. There he established himself as soon as his official task was over for the day; there he found most of the printed authorities for his subject and a sympathetic helper in Sir Henry Howorth, then one of the most active of the Chetham feoffees, who did his best to add to the library new books that helped his work. Wylie's dedication of his first volume to Humphrey Chetham's memory shows his appreciation of the companionship of his books "in the quiet seclusion of the college preserved to us by his liberality as a relic of the Lancastrian age."

The first volume of the *History of England under Henry IV* was published in 1884 by Messrs Longmans. Though it only ranged from 1399 to 1404, a sanguine title page declared the work to be "in two volumes." As a matter of fact four were found necessary. They appeared in 1894, 1896 and 1898. Including the twelve years of preparation, their composition involved the work of twenty-six years.

During this long period Wylie worked out for himself the method of investigation to which he remained faithful for the rest of his life. His aim was to collect in chronological order the detailed story of the years he was investigating. He seldom paused to generalise or recapitulate. If he were diverted from his course, it was through the lure of some strange word or phrase, or by the attraction of some incident that lay remote from the general current of his work. Critics have expatiated upon his excessive love of detail, his digressions, and his rather "modernist" attitude to mediaeval civilisation. But he was deaf to the written or spoken exhortations of his advisers. It was his own method; it suited him; it enabled him to cover the ground and he was not going to alter it. Yet within these lines he showed a real development in his historical power. The inadequacies of execution found in the early part of the first volume are scarcely to be found in his later work. His grasp over his material became greater; his acquaintance with unprinted sources became deeper and he trusted more and more to the material contained in the Public Record Office. Starting with little knowledge of any history outside his period, he learnt history by writing it and saw more and more clearly the general tendencies of his time. After all he had no reason for dissatis-

faction. A solitary scholar, starting with little help or encouragement, he succeeded in doing for the reign he made his own more than any historian has done for any other corresponding period of our mediaeval history. Even the first volume inspired competent scholars to express the wish that every reign in mediaeval history should have its annals set forth with the same thoroughness that Wylie had devoted to the early years of Henry IV.¹ But the best of his critics noted in later instalments a "marked advance in thoroughness and historical grasp" and declared his book "the only monograph in the last two centuries in English medieval history which can compare in thoroughness of research with the corresponding volumes of foreign historians."² There are few mediaevalists who would dissent from this opinion.

Recognition slowly came with the completion of Wylie's work. In 1899 he was elected Ford's Lecturer on English History at Oxford, and in 1902 Manchester University gave him the honorary degree of Litt.D. He still went on with his historical work, publishing in 1900 the six Ford lectures on *The Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus* (Longmans). This was perhaps the least successful of his writings. It is not lacking in thoroughness, insight and learning, but his method of detailed chronological narration was particularly ill-adapted to lecture conditions. He was, however, soon at work on lines more congenial to his habits. His ambition now was to deal with the reign of Henry V in the same elaborate fashion with which he had examined that of his father. Somewhat hampered for want of books when stationed at Shrewsbury and Hereford, he welcomed his establishment in London as giving him easy access to the Record Office and British Museum. He now gave himself a little more leisure to look around, and a few valuable notes in the *English Historical Review* showed the lines on which he was working³. He also made a report on the records of the Corporation of Exeter, for the Historical MSS. Commission, which was published after his death in 1916. As previously, he covered most of the ground before he published anything, but after 1909 his release from official duty enabled him to devote his whole time to his new venture. At

¹ See, for instance, Dr Charles Plummer's review of vol. 1 in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* 1, 786-8.

² Prof. Tait in *Ib.* IX, 761-5; XII, 351-3; XIV, 557.

³ *Ib.* XIX, 96; XXI, 723; XXIV, 84; XXIX, 322.

last in 1914 the Cambridge Press issued in stately form his *Reign of Henry V, 1413-1415*. This was the last book which he himself saw through the press. It was quickly followed by a breakdown in health which made further work difficult. However, he had his second volume ready for the press and had corrected the proof sheets of nearly a quarter of it when death came on 28 Feb. 1914. The war delayed its publication until 1919 and his family saw it through the press. But the rest of his manuscript was far from complete, and required almost complete recasting, while the last period of the reign involved still more drastic treatment. It is a matter of congratulation to all lovers of good scholarship that this work, "the sole occupation of his leisure and the last thing in his thoughts when he died," has now been given to the world, supplemented and brought to a conclusion by the care of a younger fellow-worker in the same field.

CHAPTER XLVIII

SIGISMUND IN FRANCE

THERE is no need to recount the events¹ which led up to the journey of King Sigismund from Constance westward in his vain endeavour to induce Pope Benedict to submit himself to the decision of the Council. Leaving Constance on July 18, 1415, he arrived at Perpignan on Sept. 19², and left it again on Nov. 5. The story of the fruitless conferences that took place there belongs to the ecclesiastical rather than to the secular history of the time. But in undertaking the journey Sigismund had other plans in view besides the healing of the Schism. Five days before leaving Constance³ he had called a meeting of the four nations and addressed them in reference to the purpose of his coming journey. He said that his heart was set not only on securing the union of the Church⁴ but on establishing peace between the kings of France and England⁵, between the dukes of Orléans and Burgundy, and between the Teutonic Order and the Poles, so that the way might be cleared for a crusade against the blaspheming Turks in the Holy Land⁶. But this programme was far too heavy to be carried out, and it is not surprising to find it subjected to repeated modification. On Aug. 30⁷, when at Narbonne, he declared that his chief purpose was to secure the submission of Benedict; that accomplished, he would go back to Constance at once. Four days later⁸ it was rumoured that the English had captured Harfleur and were already besieging Rouen, whereupon he decided that he would certainly visit Paris after sending a bishop or two beforehand to urge a suspension of hostilities till he should arrive, and about the same time he told envoys of the duke of Brabant that

¹ They are fully treated in Wylie, Constance, chap. iv.

² [Finke, Acta, ii. 49]; Valois, iv. 333.

³ Martène, Anec. ii. 1640.

⁴ "Pour le fait de l'église et autres choses de leurs affaires," Cagny, 103.

⁵ Morosini, ii. 56, 92; Rym. ix. 373; Janssen, i. 297; Gesta, 75; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 132. For his previous despatch of envoys to the kings of France and England notifying his wish to make peace see Tit. Liv. 23; Vita, 73; Kingsford, Lit. 327; Wylie, Constance, 14.

⁶ Niem, Vita, 41; Caro, Kanzlei, 121.

⁷ Dynter, iii. 290 sq.

⁸ Ibid. 292.

he depended on their master to join him in Paris and help in the task of reconciliation¹. Then for some months his attention was mainly given to the wearisome negotiations which culminated in the conference at Narbonne on Dec. 13, 1415, when it was agreed that the potentates who had hitherto upheld Benedict should send representatives to the General Council, authorising them to join in any proceedings against him if he still remained obdurate. It was now generally hoped that Sigismund would go back to Constance and wind up the business of the Council; but as not less than three months must elapse before the Spanish contingent could arrive there, he decided at least to visit Paris and see what could be done in the cause of peace². On hearing of the fall of Harfleur, he had despatched Hartung van Clux and Nicholas of Reibnitz³ to the French headquarters, offering to mediate for a truce, but by the time they arrived at Rouen the French were confident that they had Henry in their power and were fully resolved to fight⁴. The envoys were therefore detained until it was too late to discuss the matter. Sigismund used to say afterwards that if the French had allowed them to proceed, there need have been no Agincourt at all.

On leaving Narbonne Sigismund made his way by easy stages to Avignon, where he stayed three weeks, enjoying dances and tourneys and living with his suite at free quarters, while the townsmen made him a present of 3000 gulden⁵. During his stay word came in that the dauphin was dead and that the duke of Burgundy was likely to force his way into the capital. This staggering news upset his plans, and when he announced that he would halt at Lyons it was believed that he would after all return at once to Constance⁶. It was therefore with somewhat uncertain prospects that the party moved up the Rhône⁷. On Jan. 22, 1416, they entered Lyons, where they spent a fortnight⁸, while the chronicler, Eberhard Windecke, was despatched to Geneva to endeavour to raise money. At Lyons Sigismund was visited by envoys from both

¹ Dynter, iii. 293; Altmann, i. 126.

² Pulka, 43.

³ Pray, ii. 261. Both could speak English (Windecke, 87).

⁴ "Sie wolten striten und nit anders thün," Windecke, 87.

⁵ Valois, iv. 358; Windecke, 64.

⁶ Pulka, 40; Aschbach, ii. 430; A. Leroux, 170.

⁷ Martène, Anec. ii. 1659; Mansi, xxviii. 920; Dvořak, 100.

⁸ For documents dated at Lyons from Jan. 26 to Feb. 5, see A. Leroux, 170; Altmann, i. 129.

the duke of Burgundy¹ and the government in Paris, the latter offering him 300 crowns a day if he would come and lend his help in bringing about an understanding with England²; and on receipt of this message he decided to go forward. But in the meantime the count of Savoy (Amédée VIII) was pressing his claim to a dukedom, and as the French king's officials refused to allow the investiture to take place on French soil, a move had to be made across the Saône to the castle of Montluel³, where an edict was issued creating the count the first duke of Savoy. Thence the party moved eastward to Chambéry⁴, where the formal investiture took place with great ceremony on Feb. 19⁵. The duke paid 12,000 crowns for his new dignity⁶.

Returning to Lyons, Sigismund now set his face definitely towards Paris. The exact route that he followed is not clear, but he seems to have touched the Loire at Nevers⁷, and he certainly approached Paris from the south. The duke of Burgundy had by now withdrawn his troops; the road was safe and open, and the capital wholly in the power of the Armagnacs. Sigismund's cavalcade numbered from 800 to 1000 men⁸, mounted on small horses⁹ and wearing over their armour black jupons which displayed on front and back the double or apostolic upright cross of Hungary¹⁰ in ashen grey, with the motto of the Order of the Dragon, "O quam misericors est Deus¹¹." The provost and some of the citizens of Paris rode out to meet them at Étampes and Longjumeau, and at Bourg-la-Reine they were welcomed by the duke of Berry, the count of Armagnac, and cardinal Louis, duke of Bar¹². Sigismund fell on the duke of Berry's neck and kissed him, and the two rode on together,

¹ Mirot, D'Orgemont, 168.

² Windecke, 64; Gesta, 76; Caro, Kanzlei, 109; Janssen, i. 296; Beaucourt, i. 262.

³ Monstr. iii. 172; Waurin, ii. 239; Paradin, Bourgogne, 616; Guichenon, ii. 31; Bonal, 563 sq.; Mezeray, ii. 571.

⁴ Reading "Camberiacum" for "Chanteriacum" in *Aen. Sylv., Orat. iii. 179*. Cf. "in castro Chamberiaci" (Cibrario, *Altacomba*, 154) and "Camberii" (Pingone, *Augusta*, 61). For a letter of Sigismund dated at Chambéry, Feb. 10, 1416, see Curteys, f. 166 a [125].

⁵ Leibnitz, *Codex*, i. 309-313; Guichenon, ii. 31, iv. 252; Grillet, ii. 42; Altmann, i. 130; Sickel, 189; Cordeliers, 232; Caro, *Kanzlei*, 65; J. H. Costa de Beauregard, i. 250, 344; A. Leroux, 172, quoting Staindel, *Chronicon, in Rerum Boicarum Scriptores*, i. 529.

⁶ Justinger, 236.

⁷ Windecke, 165.

⁸ Le Fèvre, i. 277; Monstr. iii. 135; Aschbach, ii. 155.

⁹ Monstr. iii. 137.

¹⁰ For the cross of Hungary as Sigismund's arms, see Hardt, v. 28.

¹¹ Monstr. iii. 137; Windecke, 130; Pray, *Hist.* ii. 199.

¹² Bouvier, 431; Gilles, 223; Mamerot, 272; Monstr. iii. 135; Le Fèvre, i. 277; Gall. *Christ.* ix. 895.

entering the city in great state by the Porte St Jacques on Sunday, March 1. They went first to the palace on the island, where the king, who was then fairly sensible, was brought out on to the steps in the courtyard to bid a formal greeting¹. Thence they passed on to the Louvre, where Sigismund and all his suite were lodged during the greater part of his stay².

This reception was encouraging, and indeed Sigismund's hosts did their best to make his stay pleasant. The University solemnly presented him with an address of welcome³; he saw the sights of Paris and the suburbs⁴; valuable gifts were bestowed on him and costly banquets given in his honour⁵; and throughout his visit he lived at free quarters⁶. Nevertheless he soon took a dislike to the place, for there was continual faction-fighting between the Armagnacs and the Burgundians, who were always cutting one another's throats in the street⁷. Nor was it long before the Parisians grew tired of Sigismund. They were disgusted with his dirty and shabby clothing, his shameless and promiscuous amours⁸, his greed and meanness⁹, though for this last defect he was not wholly to blame, seeing that he was, as usual, very short of money. Certain incidents seem to have caused special offence. Thus, at a banquet and dance, given at the duke of Berry's expense, to which 120 of the most honourable ladies of Paris had been invited¹⁰, Sigismund is said to have got drunk and behaved indecently¹¹. Even more indiscreet was his conduct when on March 16 he visited the Palace and listened to the pleadings in the *Parlement*. Not content with being allowed to occupy the king's seat above the president, he caused some murmuring by wanting to preside in

¹ Baye, ii. 241; Denifle, *Auctarium*, ii. 205; St Denys, v. 744; Bourgeois, 69; Juv. 529; Douët d'Arcq, i. 382; Gesta, 76; Chron. Giles, 67.

² Monstr. iii. 135; Le Fèvre, i. 278; Caro, *Kanzlei*, 106.

³ Launois, i. 123; Denifle, *Auctarium*, ii. 205; [Finke, *Acta*, iv. 457].

⁴ Bourgeois, 69 n.; Basler Chron. v. 162; Altmann, 132; Valois, iv. 358; Gall. Christ. vii. 142.

⁵ Mirot, 272 sq.; Juv. 529; Montreuil, 1444; Valois, iv. 357.

⁶ Montreuil, 1444.

⁷ Windecke, 65; St Denys, vi. 48.

⁸ Montreuil, 1449.

⁹ Bourgeois, 69 n.; Valois, iv. 358. [But cf. Finke, *Acta*, iv. 455, n. 1].

¹⁰ Bourgeois, 69; Juv. 530; St Denys, v. 746.

¹¹ Montreuil, 1448 sqq. Jean de Montreuil's account of Sigismund's conduct in Paris, which is very bitter and scurrilous, has been regarded by most modern writers as almost wholly untrue; but the writer was in Paris at the time and there is nothing in his story inconsistent with what we know of the character of Sigismund. Jean de Montreuil was a canon of Notre Dame and Rouen and provost of St Pierre at Lille (see Finke, *Kleinere Quellen*, 465 sqq.; Grudé, i. 556; Foppens, ii. 698; Paquot, ii. 262; A. Thomas, *Joh. de Monsterolio*, 3 sqq.; Feret, iv. 143; Piaget, *Cour*, 430).

person¹. It happened that a cause was before the court in which a Provençal, Guillaume Seignet, lord of Vaucluse, and Guy Pestel were contending for the stewardship of Beaucaire. The former being at a disadvantage because he was not yet a knight, Sigismund asked him in Latin if he would like to be made one, and borrowing a sword from one of his attendants, knighted the man forthwith. The court could not conceal its amazement at this unmannerly encroachment on the prerogative of their absent king²; but in the end French politeness prevailed³, and the incident stands entered in the official register without any sign of protest. The court, it is true, was afterwards severely blamed by the Council for allowing such a flagrant defiance of the legal maxim that the king was emperor in his own realm⁴; but the dignity conferred was never cancelled, and two years afterwards the new knight was despatched to Prague⁵ as an official representative of the king of France.

It must not be supposed, however, that the five weeks spent by Sigismund in Paris were altogether given up to gaiety and sight-seeing. From the very day of his arrival he was constantly conferring⁶ with French politicians in the hope of making peace, and according to his own account⁷ he offered to marry his only child and heiress Elizabeth, who was but seven years old, to one of the French king's sons if this would forward the desired end. There are, indeed, serious difficulties in accepting this statement, for the dauphin was married and his brother betrothed, while Elizabeth herself had been promised more than four years previously to her future husband, Albert IV, duke of Austria⁸. But the statement is in keeping with the careless spirit in which Sigismund approached his thorny task. He seems to have thought that he had only to ask and to have, that Harfleur and all the French prisoners would be given up by England, and that the two countries would then join him in driving out the Turks⁹. The opinion among his suite was that there might be a truce for four or five years, and that at the end of that time

¹ Baye, ii. 244; St Denys, v. 744; Juv. 529; Douët d'Arcq, i. 382; Boulay, v. 299.

² Sauval, ii. 5.

³ "Sous dissimulation," Monstr. iii. 138; Bourgeois, 69.

⁴ For Charles V's resentment of any claim to overlordship when the emperor Charles IV visited Paris in 1378, see Beaucourt, i. 261.

⁵ Beaucourt, Les Chartier, 17; D. Delaunay, 81, from Pasquier, lib. vii. ch. xxxviii.

⁶ "Après plusieurs parlements," Monstr. iii. 136. Cf. Altmann, i. 131.

⁷ Caro, Kanzlei, 120.

⁸ Fejer, x. 5, 155, 171; Windecke, 23; Lindner, ii. 283.

⁹ Caro, Kanzlei, 121.

a new generation of Frenchmen would be growing up who might choose between revenge and a final peace¹. But at a council meeting towards the end of his stay Sigismund himself kept saying that he was tired of these endless quarrels and of this scandalous imprisonment of so many princes of the lilies—he would very soon have them all back, and he quite hoped to see a peaceful ending to it all as soon as he had had a talk with the king of England².

Sigismund awaited the return of certain messengers sent to raise money in Brussels, Bruges, Louvain, and other important towns, and then, on April 13, set out from St Denis, where he had been staying for some days³. That night the party slept in the castle at Beaumont, and on the 15th, after crossing the Oise, they reached Beauvais. Here they were joined by Renaud de Chartres, the young archbishop of Rheims, who proceeded with them to England⁴. Sigismund was lodged in the bishop's palace, and stayed at Beauvais to keep his Easter⁵. Leaving the city on April 21, the party took the road to Abbeville, whither Sigismund had already sent messengers notifying his approach; but when it was known that English envoys wearing the cross of St George were with the party, these harbingers were received with open insult and narrowly escaped with their lives⁶. Sigismund and his suite therefore crossed the Somme at Pont Remy, and rode on to the great Benedictine abbey of St Riquier⁷. Thence they proceeded by Montreuil to Étaples⁸, turning aside to visit the *croix coupée* at St Josse, where Sigismund, though received with the utmost honour by the abbot and convent, was not moved by the sight of the saint's body to leave so much as a penny behind⁹. Evidently the feeling shown at Abbeville was spreading; the captain of Boulogne had been out to Montreuil to see how the party would be received there¹⁰;

¹ Juv. 530.

² St Denys, v. 746; "sese sublimando jactitabat," Montreuil, 1449; Gilles, 223; Bourgeois, 623; Boulay, v. 316. On Feb. 10 he had written to the duke of Orléans and other leading French prisoners in England promising that he would labour for their release, Curteys, f. 166 a [125].

³ Windecke, 65; Basler Chron. v. 162; Monstr. iii. 136; Altmann, i. 132; Lenz, 83.

⁴ Gesta, 76; Tit. Liv. 23; Vita, 76; Monstr., loc. cit.; Pray, ii. 262; Kingsford, Lit. 327; Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 362; Gall. Christ. ix. 135. For a safe-conduct for the archbishop, dated April 26, 1416, to last till Aug. 1, see Rym. ix. 342; Beau-court, i. 263.

⁵ Basler Chron. v. 162; J. Meyer, 248; Monstr., loc. cit.

⁶ Caro, Kanzlei, 114; Monstr. iii. 136.

⁷ J. Meyer, 248.

⁸ Windecke, 65, 200; J. Meyer, 248; Monstr. iii. 137.

⁹ J. Meyer, 248; Baye, ii. 276.

¹⁰ E. Dupont, 130.

and when they reached Boulogne on April 24, the townsfolk, though they sent out presents of food, refused to admit Sigismund within the walls unless his retinue was reduced to 200 mounted men¹. At this he showed great indignation and told the captain to take the gifts away, as he had enough provisions of his own. He stayed for a meal in the lower town by the waterside², and then moved on. Six hundred horsemen came out of the town, with trumpeting and other music, to escort him honourably on his way; but he sent them an angry message to be gone³. This embarrassing episode brought down upon the people of Boulogne a letter from the duke of Berry⁴. Its terms are not known, but they may well have been severe, for Sigismund regarded the behaviour of the townspeople as a scandalous insult⁵, and contrasting as it did with the splendid welcome that awaited him at Calais, it could not fail to have a marked effect upon the temper in which he continued the negotiations. English territory was entered on April 25⁶; the English garrisons on his route had been instructed to receive him in their very best array⁷; and a mile from Calais the cavalcade was met by the governor—the earl of Warwick—with a splendid escort of knights and archers⁸. Sigismund had already had proof of the earl's skill in the lists, and now, delighted at his reception, he declared that Warwick was second to none for wisdom, good breeding and valour⁹.

In this pleasant fashion began the second stage of Sigismund's peacemaking tour, from which so much had been expected. Meanwhile his own kingdom of Hungary was in imminent danger from the Turks, and the Council at Constance was crying aloud for the return of its only hope¹⁰. But throughout Sigismund went about his business in the same leisurely and casual way, spending no less than a year and a half away from Constance. The truth seems to be that he stayed wherever he was comfortable, and that once in he was usually unable to get out for want of the necessary funds to carry him on. His estimates of time and distance were in any case ridiculous. Thus, when on April 5,

¹ Windecke, 93.

² E. Dupont, 162.

³ Aschbach, ii. 161.

⁴ Received May 3: "faisans mencion sur le fait du Roy des Rommans," E. Dupont, 92.

⁵ Caro, Kanzlei, 114.

⁶ Altmann, i. 132.

⁷ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 193.

⁸ Monstr. iii. 137.

⁹ Rous, 366; Carysfort, p. xxxiv; Worcester, Itin. 354; Dugdale, Baronage, i. 245; Warwicksh. i. 407.

¹⁰ Vrie in Hardt, i. c. 189 sqq.; Lenz, 77.

1416, he summoned his vicegerent, John Kanitza, archbishop of Gran, to come from Buda-Pest with Hermann, count of Cilly, and take part in the negotiations, he added that he would probably be back in Constance by Whitsuntide, and, having brought the Council to a satisfactory conclusion, would return to Hungary before the end of the year¹.

¹ Martène, *Anec.* ii. 1662; Altmann, i. 131.

CHAPTER XLIX

SIGISMUND AND HENRY

BEFORE Sigismund had left Paris, it was known in England that his arrival might soon be looked for, and on April 7 the sheriffs were ordered to summon all knights and squires to be in London by the 16th to give him a welcome¹. It was believed that he was already at Calais, and 300 vessels were hastily sent over from Dover to bring the party across². All the arrangements were put into the hands of Sir Walter Hungerford, and the royal officers posted down to Dover to arrange that all expenses should be charged to the king's account³. On April 26 a safe-conduct was issued for one of Sigismund's secretaries⁴, but some days were still to elapse before Sigismund himself landed. Thus there was plenty of time to complete the preparations. Beds were mended and repaired for the visitors' use⁵. The royal barge was covered with scarlet cloth and furnished with cushions of imperial and Lucchese cloth of gold⁶. All towns on the route were ordered to supply provisions to the visitors without taking any money from them⁷.

It took several days to get Sigismund's horses and baggage on board at Calais, but on May 1⁸ he made the passage in five hours and landed the same night at Dover⁹. As his ship neared the land, the duke of Gloucester and other magnates rode into the water with drawn swords, and the duke, as Constable, declared that they would resist his landing unless he disclaimed all imperial rights over England¹⁰. Sigismund of

¹ Rym. ix. 339; Lett. Bk. I, pp. xxviii, 160.

² Rym., loc. cit.; Tit. Liv. 23; Kingsford, Lit. 327. The Council had already advised that the clerk of the king's ships should be provided with funds for this purpose, Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 194.

³ Rym. ix. 340.

⁴ Ibid. 342.

⁵ Exchequer Accts. 406/26.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Rym. ix. 340.

⁸ Altmann, i. 132. The date is wrongly given as April 30 by Windecke (66) and as April 28 by Monstrelet (iii. 137). Cf. Gesta, 76; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 133; Tit. Liv. 23.

⁹ Windecke, 66; Tit. Liv. 23; Vita, 75; Kingsford, Lit. 327. Windecke, who followed on May 3, took two days and two nights to cross from Calais to Sandwich, and landed "well-nigh drowned."

¹⁰ This story has been generally discredited by modern writers, who thought that it rested on no better authority than that of Hall, Holinshed, and Redman, but the incident is described by the "Translator of Livius," who had the story from "the honorable

course declared that he came merely as the king's friend and as a mediator, and was then formally welcomed and lodged in the castle. Next day the party reached Canterbury, where they were received by Archbishop Chichele and stayed three days, visiting the churches and Becket's shrine¹. It had been arranged by the Council that at each of the two halting-places between Canterbury and London Sigismund should be met by one of the king's brothers with a number of nobles and warriors just returned from the victory, who would afterwards fall in and swell the train as it moved onwards to London². So at Rochester³ the party were received by the duke of Bedford, together with the earl of Oxford, the lords Camoys and Powys, and Sir William Bourchier, the constable of the Tower, and at Dartford⁴ the duke of Clarence was awaiting them, accompanied by the earls of March and Huntingdon, the lords Grey of Ruthin, Poynings, and Abergavenny, and Sir John Cornwall. On May 7⁵ the mayor, aldermen, and citizens of London came out to join the escort at Blackheath, and the king himself was posted at St Thomas' Watering⁶ attended by 5000 magnates in their richest array. The two monarchs kissed and did much obeisance each to each⁷, and the long procession moved on, the "most victorious" king riding with his "most superillustrious brother⁸" on his right and Archbishop Chichele on his left⁹. At Southwark they crossed the bridge, and entered the crowded and beflagged city, where the people thronged every street to catch a glimpse of the "unknown king¹⁰." After Earle of Ormonde" (Kingsford, *First Life*, 67). [The identity of the earl and the value of the material ascribed to him are discussed in Appendix Z².] Another chronicle discovered by Mr Kingsford, who regards it as a compilation of the year 1447, shows that by the middle of the century there was a legend that Sigismund had demanded tribute of Henry: "tempore istius Regis Henrici Sigismundus Imperator Romanorum venit in Angliam tributum petere a dicto Rege Henrico, et de quo tenebat terras suas diligenter inquirendo. Cumque hoc audisset predictus Rex extracto ense Imperatori dicit: Quod a nullo homine vel principe tenebat nisi per solum gladium. Quod Imperator audiens deinceps non petiuit tributum, set precipue desiderabat vt fieri posset Miles de la Garture." (E.H.R. xxvi. 750 sqq.) This looks like a distortion of the story preserved in the *First Life*.

¹ Windecke, 66, 200; Basler Chron. v. 163.

² Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 194.

³ Gesta, 76 sq.; W. B. Rye, 5; Archaeol. Cant. vi. 47; not at Canterbury, as Kingsford, Chron. 124.

⁴ Gesta, 77; Capgrave, *De Illustr. Hen.* 118; Kingsford, loc. cit.

⁵ Wals. ii. 315; Chron. Lond. 103, 159; Kingsford, Chron. 71, 124; Riley, Mem. 627; Lett. Bk. I, p. xxviii; Basler Chron. v. 162; Altmann, i. 132.

⁶ Brut, ii. 381; Kingsford, Chron. 124, Lit. 299.

⁷ Ibid. 300.

⁸ Gesta, 78; Chron. Giles, 67.

⁹ Chron. Lond. 103; Lib. Met. 133.

¹⁰ Basler Chron. v. 163; Monstr. iii. 144; Waurin, ii. 232; Tit. Liv. 24; Vita, 76.

a halt for a *Te Deum* at St Paul's, they passed on to Westminster, where the palace was given up to the visitors¹. King Henry crossed to the archbishop's palace at Lambeth, which was to be his residence as long as his guests should stay². What Sigismund thought of his reception does not appear from any recorded words of his own, but an English chronicler declares that he was delighted³, and one of his suite declared that no king was ever more handsomely received, and that Sigismund lacked words to express his admiration for the splendour of the horses and the magnificence of the noble and lovely women who came out to meet him in their costliest gowns⁴. But the best proof of Sigismund's satisfaction is afforded by the length of his stay. If his own estimate is to be trusted, he meant to remain but a few days in order to be back in Constance by Whitsuntide, and it is true that many of his retinue took passage for home within a month⁵. He himself, however, stayed nearly four months and put Henry's hospitality to the severest strain⁶. Four days after his arrival an item of £1666. 13s. 4d. occurs in the Exchequer records as the cost of his journey from Calais to London⁷. Throughout his visit the choicest wines and meats were set before him every day, and the royal servants waited at his table. Honours and gifts were showered upon him. He received presents wherever he went. King Henry gave him 5000 nobles in two gilt basins, a gold head, two silver-gilt cups, and a gold mixer, together with rubies, pearls, and amethysts believed to be worth 40,000 crowns⁸. Horses with splendid harness and trappings were presented to him and to members of his suite⁹, though, to do them justice, they gave a number

¹ Gesta, 77; Wals. ii. 315; Kingsford, Chron. 124; Brut, ii. 381; Exch. Accts. 406/26. So completely was the emperor's convenience studied that a separate entrance was made for the king to pass into the Exchequer without disturbing the privacy of his guest (Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Pasch., July 24, 1416).

² Gesta, 77; Wals. ii. 316; Kingsford, Chron. 124; Chron. Giles, 68; Brut, ii. 381; Riley, Mem. 627.

³ Vita, 75.

⁴ Windecke, 66.

⁵ Payments for shipping for their passage are recorded in Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Pasch., June 3, 5, 1416.

⁶ Contemporary opinion was much impressed by the expense to which Henry was put by Sigismund's visit; cf. Vita, 75; Usk, 130; Strecche, 268; Brut, ii. 381, 559; Kingsford, Lit. 278; [E.H.R. xxix. 511 (from a Latin chronicle from the Creation to 1418, extracts from which have been printed by Mr Kingsford in an article entitled "An Historical Collection of the Fifteenth Century," E.H.R. xxix. 505 sq.)].

⁷ Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Pasch., May 11, 1416; Exch. Accts. 328/6, May 9, 1416; *ibid.* 106/24 (1).

⁸ Exch. Accts. 406/26; Windecke, xxx. 82 sq.; Justinger, 237; St Denys, vi. 54.

⁹ For. Accts. 52, A.

of horses to the English king¹. Henry even gave Sigismund his collar of SS, which he henceforth wore in public on all ceremonial occasions². He was lavishly entertained at banquets by the great nobles and other notable Englishmen³; the king's horses were placed at his disposal, and he hunted in the forests to his heart's content⁴. King Henry took him about to see the country. Parliament, which had really finished its business before Easter, actually re-assembled in honour of his visit⁵. Everything, in short, had to give way to his convenience, and it is pleasing to learn that Sigismund greatly admired all he saw, pronouncing the land to be one of great nobility and worthiness, and plenteous of good and rich people, and blessed of governance, with abundance of all worthy commodities⁶.

Of all the honours lavished upon Sigismund, by far the greatest in contemporary estimation was his admission to the Order of the Garter. Four vacancies in the Order had occurred during the previous year through the deaths of Henry Lord Scrope, who had been executed at Southampton, the earl of Arundel, who had died on his return from Harfleur, the duke of York, who had been killed at Agincourt, and Sir John Dabridgecourt⁷. It had been decided that the gaps should be filled by Sir William Harington⁸, the earls of Huntingdon and Oxford, and William Lord Zouche of Harringworth; but the last had died in November, 1415⁹, and a vacant stall thus remained at the king's disposal. St George's Day was the proper day for the annual chapter and the admission of new knights, but it was customary to postpone the festival if April 23 fell within fifteen days of Easter¹⁰. The date fixed for this year was May 24¹¹, and preparations were made for an installation of exceptional magnificence. On May 18 orders were given that the best lodgings in the castle and the college at Windsor should be made ready for Sigismund and his suite¹². The garter

¹ Exch. Accts. 106/24 (1).

² Wals. ii. 316; Rym. viii. 165, ix. 434 sq., 441; cf. Montreuil, 1444.

³ Waurin, ii. 234.

⁴ Vita, 76.

⁵ See vol. ii. 322.

⁶ Kingsford, Lit. 300.

⁷ See vol. i. 317.

⁸ Harington succeeded Scrope. He died March 12, 1440 (Beltz, pp. lvi, clvii, clx).

⁹ See vol. i. 40, n. 1.

¹⁰ See Statutes of Hen. V in Ashmole, Instit., App.

¹¹ "Die dominico in clavibus rogationum," Gesta, 78; Curteys, f. 166 b; Lett. Bk. I. pp. xxviii, 161; Riley, Mem. 627; Basler Chron. v. 163.

¹² Anstis, i. 29; Ashmole, App. clxxii, which should be dated 4 (not 7) Hen. V; Tighe and Davis, i. 284, from Ashmole MS. 1125, f. 101 b.

and the blue silk mantle were supplied as required by the statutes, and on Friday, May 22, they journeyed down, escorted by the existing knights, each booted and spurred and in his habit¹. On the following day the earl of Suffolk conducted the candidate to the bath², and he was then ushered in to the chapter-house to be invested as a knight elect, a gentleman of blood and without reproach amongst the mightiest and most illustrious princes and the most powerful nobles of England³. The installation took place on the Sunday in St George's Chapel⁴. At this ceremony King Henry took care to occupy the chief place both in the procession and at the Mass; but at the feast which followed in the great hall, Sigismund was invited to preside at table⁵, having on his right King Henry, with Louis duke of Brieg and Nicholas of Gara, the count palatine or ban of Hungary, and on his left the duke of Bedford with Bishops Beaufort and Langley⁶, the former as prelate of the Order⁷. Of these occupants of the high table only Sigismund and Henry were served with the three great "subtleties," which represented St George being armed by the Virgin, fighting the dragon, and entering a castle accompanied by a king's daughter leading a lamb⁸. That Sigismund alone shared these dainties with Henry was probably intended as a mark of gratitude for a gift which Sigismund had made. He had a special interest in St George: in 1408 he had founded the Order of the Dragon⁹; and he had somehow obtained possession of what purported to be the champion's heart. When the earl

¹ Kingsford, Chron. 124.

² Cf. Statutes of Henry V in Ashmole, Instit., App.; Exch. Accts. 406/26, which is the document marked "ex rot. de computis garderobie, penes camer" in Rym. ix. 334 sq. It contains payments for covering the bed "post balneam," for covering the king's chair with baudekin, and for covering the bath inside, in front, and in the bottom, for the earl of Suffolk and his servant. For the earliest known example (1377) of the bath as part of the process in the creation of knighthood, see Shaw, i, p. xiii.

³ Basler Chron. v. 163.

⁴ Originally called the chapel of St Edward, but rebuilt and renamed by Edward III. The present chapel dates from the reign of Henry VII.

⁵ "The Emperour kept the state at the mete," Three Fifteenth Cent. Chron. 55; Fabyan, 581; Anstis, ii. 65. In Curteys (f. 166 b), however, Henry seems to preside, with Sigismund on his right.

⁶ Reading "Dunelm" for "Develyn" in Chron. Lond. 159, and "Dyvelyn" in Three Fifteenth Cent. Chron. 55.

⁷ Ashmole, 235, 514; Beltz, lii; Chron. Lond. 159; Greg. Chron. 113; Fabyan, 581.

⁸ Three Fifteenth Cent. Chron. 55; Tighe and Davis, 284.

⁹ On the occasion of his marriage with Barbara of Cilly, Dec. 12. Pray, Hist. ii. 149; Fejer, x. 4, 683; Aschbach, i. 263; Caro, Kanzlei, 16, 23.

of Warwick fought before him in the lists at Constance¹, he offered him this holy relic to take back with him to England. The earl, however, had requested that Sigismund would retain it and bring it with him on his projected visit. This he had now done. At Windsor they had only one of the saint's bones, a piece of his arm, and part of his skull², so that his heart was a very welcome present. What has become of it no one knows, but it was certainly shown to some Bohemian visitors in 1466³, and was carried in procession every year down to the time of Henry VIII⁴. To the modern historian, however, St George's heart is less interesting than the statutes promulgated at this chapter, which are our earliest authority for the regulations of the Order, all previous ones having wholly perished⁵.

Sigismund had not entirely neglected the object of his mission during the first weeks of his sojourn in England; for the terms of the alliance projected two years before had been re-examined, and the question of peace had also been debated between the two kings and their counsellors⁶. Serious consideration of this, however, had deliberately been deferred in the expectation of the early arrival in England of William, count of Holland, Zealand and Hainault⁷. The count had married Margaret, daughter of Philip the Bold, duke of Burgundy; his only daughter and heiress, Jacqueline, was the wife of the dauphin Jean⁸. He had always been on good terms with Sigismund, and was regarded as a common friend of France, England, and the Empire. Although his family connections must have rendered him suspect to the dominant party in Paris, it was at the suggestion of the king of France that he had been invited to mediate. The count, who was a knight companion of the Garter⁹, had intended to be present at the installation of Sigismund; but owing to stress of weather¹⁰ it was not until May 28 that he and his imposing retinue reached

¹ Rous, *Hist.* 269.

² *Monast.* vi. 1364 sq.; Tighe and Davis, i. 232; Anstis, ii. 40.

³ Rozmital, 45.

⁴ Rous, 367; Anstis, i. 29, ii. 40, 450; Beltz, lviii; Tighe and Davis, i. 284; E.H.R. xxvi. 751. Capgrave (313) says that Sigismund presented an image of St George made of pure gold.

⁵ Beltz, xlvi; for text, see Ashmole, *App.*; Anstis, ii. 64. Mr St John Hope believes them to be merely a revise of the original statutes of Edward III (*Stall-Plates*, 8, 13).

⁶ Wylie, *Constance*, 15; *St Denys*, vi. 54; *Gesta*, 77; *Chron. Giles*, 68.

⁷ *St Denys*, v. 748.

⁸ Cf. vol. ii. 292.

⁹ Since 1390, Beltz, xvi.

¹⁰ Goldast, *Statut.* i. 148, *Const. Imp.* i. 390; *Mieris*, iv. 372.

London¹. The chief members of the party were lodged in the bishop of Ely's hostel in Holborn²; and the king's new guests shared in the sumptuous festivities in honour of Whitsuntide and Trinity Sunday³.

On the count's arrival the peace question was at once taken up in earnest⁴. The French envoys and the leading French prisoners played a very active part in the negotiations, the purpose of the latter being to regain their freedom at any cost⁵. On June 4 Sigismund, with his customary optimism, expected that an understanding between England and France would be reached in two days⁶. But Henry, while professing willingness to agree to peace, insisted not only that the French should leave him in possession of Harfleur and a belt of adjacent country sufficient to support its garrison, but also that they should yield all that had been conceded to Edward III by the treaty of Brétigny⁷. In other words, he would waive his claim to the crown in return for the whole of western France except Brittany. The French envoys had been led to suppose that Sigismund would secure much better terms than these for their country, and there were consequently "manifold and divers discussions." A proposal that met with some favour was that while negotiations were in progress the town of Harfleur should be handed over to Sigismund and the count of Holland, all measures for its recapture or defence being suspended⁸; and it was also suggested that the principal prisoners should be released on giving hostages for their return in case the negotiations should break down. Neither plan was adopted; the proposal about Harfleur was very unpopular, and it was currently believed that the French envoys and prisoners had been convicted of treacherous intentions⁹. It was however agreed that, subject to the approval of the French king, commissioners should at once arrange for a three years' truce, and that within five weeks from

¹ Basler Chron. v. 163; Capgr. 313; Gesta, 82 n.; Kingsford, Chron. 125; Lenz, 97. They came up the river to Lambeth, Kingsford, loc. cit.; Hardyng, 376.

² Exch. Accts. 406/26; Chron. Lond. 104; Kingsford, Chron. 125; Chron. Ric. II -Hen. VI, 43; Brut, ii. 381.

³ Gesta, 82; Waurin, ii. 232; Le Fèvre, i. 279.

⁴ Cotton MS. Cleop. C. iv. f. 29 sq.

⁵ Cousinot, 136; Caro, Kanzlei, 115, 119; Rym. ix. 427.

⁶ Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, xvi. 449; cf. Caro, Kanzlei, 112.

⁷ Rym. ix. 787; Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 362.

⁸ Rym. ix. 362.

⁹ Kingsford, Chron. 125; Gesta, 79 sq. Lett. Bk. I. pp. xxix, 152, shows that the proposal about Harfleur had failed before June 13. See also Valois, iv. 361.

the conclusion of the truce the kings of England and France, together with Sigismund and the count of Holland, should meet on the frontier of the march of Calais¹. Armed with these proposals, the archbishop of Rheims and his colleagues returned to France² accompanied by the lord of Gaucourt³, who was authorised to speak on behalf of the French prisoners. They had been preceded by Nicholas of Gara, the archbishop of Gran, and several of Sigismund's suite, who presented the proposals at Paris in a tentative way⁴.

It was of ill omen that the count of Holland had already fallen out with both Sigismund and Henry. He had asked the former to recognise his daughter Jacqueline as heir to his titles and power; but Sigismund replied that the rule of women was not for the good of the State, and asked if the count had no cousin or brother to succeed him⁵. Of course he had a brother, the bishop of Liège; but this was the very man he wanted to exclude. In his annoyance, he left England abruptly, on June 21, telling Henry that if the invasion of France were renewed, his standard-bearer would be in the field against the English⁶. Politics were now suspended. On June 26 Henry left London for Southampton⁷, and on the same day Sigismund set out for Leeds castle⁸, where he spent a month⁹. Two days later Ralph Rochford, Robert Waterton, and Master Philip Morgan were commissioned to represent England in the negotiations¹⁰.

The English envoys left London on July 3. Before they reached Paris the French king had assented to the agreement made in London, and had named Beauvais as the meeting-place of the conference which should settle the terms of the

¹ St Denys, vi. 18, 20, 24; Rym. ix. 787; Champollion-Figeac, *Lettres*, ii. 362; Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 24,062, f. 193 b.

² Tit. Liv. 24; Vita, 77; the archbishop's safe-conduct is dated June 20 (Rym. ix. 364).

³ Rym. ix. 426; Monstr. iii. 146 sq.

⁴ Gesta, 82; St Denys, vi. 16; Valois, iv. 360. For the text of the proposals see St Denys, vi. 18-22; cf. Caro, *Kanzlei*, 21, 99, 108, *Bündniss*, 25; Lenz, 105; Bess, *Bündniss*, 651, 655.

⁵ Windecke, 69; Wagenaar, iii. 406; Snoy, 134.

⁶ Leyden, 344; Le Petit, i. 351.

⁷ Cf. vol. ii. 355. Chap. XLIV above should be read in conjunction with the account of the negotiations with France.

⁸ Devon, 346; Chron. Lond. 104; Kingsford, Chron. 126; Reichstagsakten, vii. 133.

⁹ Basler Chron. v. 164. His removal to Leeds from Westminster cost £300 (Exch. Accts. 328/6, June 27, 1416; Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Pasch., July 4, 1416; Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 24,513, f. 13); and another £300 had been paid for his expenses before July 6 (Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Pasch., July 6, 1416).

¹⁰ Rym. ix. 366.

truce. News of Charles' decision soon spread far and wide, often much embellished¹; Sigismund was overjoyed on hearing it², and even Henry seems to have been sufficiently impressed by it to abandon his intention of sailing for the relief of Harfleur in person and actually to have contemplated disbanding his fleet³.

All this confidence was misplaced. Charles VI, indeed, was in earnest, and at a Council held in Paris on July 15 the majority of those present, headed by the duke of Anjou, were about to consider arrangements for a personal interview between the rival kings⁴. Then, however, the count of Armagnac rose, and used all his fiery eloquence to defeat the whole project. What did they know about the terms that would be offered for a final peace? They could only be sure, from their experience of Sigismund, that they would be in favour of the English. And what was this three years' truce? Nothing but a means for saving Harfleur from its present desperate plight. But give him his way, and God's head! he would starve it out in three months⁵. So far he carried the Council with him⁶, and it was known that he had the university and the city of Paris at his back⁷; but when he urged that they should refuse even to receive an English embassy, feeling was against him, and it was resolved to affect a serious interest in the plan and to spin out the negotiations for a truce, while a grip was still kept on Harfleur in the hope of its speedy surrender. Accordingly safe-conducts were issued for the three English envoys, who duly arrived at Beauvais on July 17⁸. There they were met by the archbishop of Rheims, Gontier Col, Guillaume le Bouteiller, and Simon de Nanterre, and futile talk was kept up till the month was nearly out. The Frenchmen said that they must consult the king of Castile before they could enter into a three years' treaty, and thought that a truce of one year would be enough: the Englishmen required time to ask advice from home⁹; they complained that they had been insulted and prevented from leaving their lodgings, and that the negotiations were only being continued to gain time and to ensure the capitulation of Harfleur, now

¹ For the reports that reached Bruges and Venice, see Morosini, ii. 98.

² Caro, Kanzlei, 116. [Cf. Finke, Acta, iv. 463]. ³ Gesta, 83. Cf. vol. ii. 356.

⁴ Rym. ix. 378; Ordonnances, x. 371; Baye, ii. 257; Cousinot, 136.

⁵ St Denys, vi. 24; Windecke, 142.

⁶ Morosini, ii. 100.

⁷ Cousinot, 138.

⁸ St Denys, vi. 26.

⁹ Caro, Kanzlei, 21, 103, 107, 108, 109, 117, Bündniss, 43, 103.

believed by the French to be imminent¹. On July 29 it was arranged that representatives of both sides should be at Calais and Boulogne respectively before Aug. 16 and that further discussion should then take place²; but the truth was that the negotiations had so far failed, and the struggle for Harfleur was allowed to take its course. When it was believed that nothing more was to be looked for, Henry threw all the blame on the French Council³, while Sigismund, who entirely exonerated the English, wept tears of mortification and anger at having been duped by the French, who were trying, he complained, to wreck the Council of Constance and destroy the Holy Roman Empire⁴. Contemporary English writers with one voice declaim against the bad faith and arrogance of the French⁵, and when Gaucourt returned to London, he found himself actually in danger of his life⁶. The French on their part blamed Sigismund for the failure⁷, and at Constance it was evidently believed that many Englishmen were of the same opinion, for rumours were abroad that his life too was in jeopardy—some said indeed that he had been poisoned⁸. As a matter of fact, to all outward seeming his relations with Henry were more friendly than ever. He had left Leeds on July 27, and on the following day had reached Eltham⁹, where he stayed till Aug. 9, and it was probably towards the end of this time that he began to suspect that the negotiations in France were likely to fail, for on his departure he set his face for the coast¹⁰. Accompanied by Henry he entered Canterbury on Aug. 12¹¹, and on the 15th—the very day on which the French and English fleets were at death blows in the Seine—the two kings signed a treaty of mutual help and alliance¹², the

¹ Gesta, 84; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 137; Capgrave, De Illustr. Hen. 119.

² Morosini, ii. 101 n.

³ Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 362.

⁴ Rym. x. 14; Kingsford, Lit. 278; Windecke, 67; Caro, Bündniss, 47, 55, Kanzlei, 108, 120; Lenz, 111; Beaucourt, i. 265; Valois, iv. 363.

⁵ Gesta, 104, 107; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 146; Tit. Liv. 27; Vita, 83; Chron. Giles, 92; Kingsford, Chron. 125, Lit. 287; Capgrave, Chron. 315, De Illustr. Hen. 120; Bodl. MS. 496, f. 2246.

⁶ Cousinot, 138; Leyden, 344.

⁷ Rym. ix. 519; Caro, Bündniss, 40.

⁸ Hardt, i. i. 190; Aschbach, ii. 166.

⁹ Basler Chron. v. 164; Gesta, 85.

¹⁰ Basler Chron., loc. cit. Sigismund's horses had already been sent across to Dordrecht (Goldast, Statut. i. 148, Const. Imp. i. 390; Mieris, iv. 372), and his jewels had long ago been packed (Rym. ix. 365). [The fourth volume of Finke's *Acta Concilii Constantiensis*, which appeared after the first proofs of this book had been passed, throws new light on Sigismund's negotiations in the summer of 1416. On Aug. 22, while admitting his disappointment at what had happened, he hoped for a speedy and fruitful resumption of discussions between the French and the English (p. 465).]

¹¹ Basler Chron., loc. cit.

¹² Rym. ix. 377–381. [It was some time before the treaty became generally known.]

sole visible fruit of his protracted visit. In the preamble Sigismund stated that his whole heart was set on restoring unity to the Church, and to further this end he had put forth great efforts to reconcile France and England. He was, however, utterly disappointed. He had put steady pressure on the king of France, had sent him formal articles agreed on by himself and the count of Holland, and had nearly got them accepted by the French royal family and the French Council, when the king, a lover of discord and child of schism, had rejected them in order that he might break up the unity of the Church with his pestiferous devices, as he had ever done. His emissaries had been at the root of all the opposition encountered by Sigismund at Perpignan, his greedy hands had robbed the Empire of many fiefs and rights, and now that Sigismund had come to help his brother of England to recover his due, the French offered him nothing but jeers and mockery. At last, therefore, he had made up his mind to stop these machinations, and in the name of the Lord had resolved to make with his injured brother an alliance on the following terms:

(a) He and his successors would from henceforth and for ever be friends, allies, and confederates of Henry and his sons, or, if Henry should have no son, then with his brothers the dukes of Clarence, Bedford, and Gloucester or whoever should succeed him, to resist attacks from every power and every person, save only from the Church and the pope;

(b) Merchants and craftsmen of either party should have free access to the dominions of the other, provided that they paid the customary dues and submitted to the existing laws¹;

(c) Neither party should harbour traitors, rebels, or exiles banished from the lands of the other, or go to war against the other except in direct self-defence, but each would help the other in recovering their respective rights from France.

Soon after Sigismund reached London in May, 1416, there arrived there a number of ambassadors from the duke of Burgundy². One object of their presence was the arrangement of a trade truce³; but they also concluded a general truce between Henry and the duke, which was to last from July 13 to Michaelmas, 1417⁴. When they left they took with them

¹ This was one of the terms offered by Henry IV when he sent envoys to Sigismund in 1411, *Simonyi*, v. 147.

² *Monstr.* iii. 144.

³ *Cf.* vol. ii. 299.

⁴ *Rym.* ix. 383.

a letter for the earl of Warwick, captain of Calais, which he was to communicate with all haste to the duke of Burgundy¹. Henry, in fact, while sanguine of the success of the negotiations with the Armagnacs, was careful to insure against their failure, and while the prospects of an agreement still seemed good, the earl of Warwick² and the duke of Brieg had been instructed to visit the duke of Burgundy together on behalf of their respective sovereigns. They started from Calais with a large company of "wise and honourable men³," and reached Lille on July 20⁴, where they were received with great honour by the duke and his son, the count of Charolais. They were splendidly entertained, and had many interviews with the duke and his counsellors during their stay of eight days⁵. They had brought the duke an invitation to be present at the conference which was expected to take place near Calais in the coming October⁶, and this the duke readily accepted, to the amazement of many⁷, who were shocked at such dealings between a subject and the enemy of his sovereign. Such astonishment was intensified when a few days later the men of Picardy refused to obey an order from Paris bidding them attack the English, pleading that the duke had forbidden them to take up arms against those with whom he had a truce except at his express command⁸. On Aug. 12 the Council repeated its order⁹, but at nightfall of that very day a large force of Burgundians from Picardy, Champagne, and the Thiérache threatened the very gates of Paris. They had come up suddenly by forced marches¹⁰, hoping to be admitted during the night by their friends inside the walls. Disappointed in this, they waited till sunrise, and then for four hours swept the ground without the walls like a hurricane, carrying off or destroying everything that came in their way, while the garrison, as if stupefied, let them work their will unopposed¹¹. After plundering between Dammartin

¹ A copy was deposited in the Exchequer on June 26 (Kal. and Inv. ii. 95). The safe-conducts of the envoys were dated June 24 (Rym. ix. 364). For £66. 13s. 4d. paid to Warwick as ambassador to the duke of Burgundy, see Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Pasch., June 27, 1416.

² £40 was paid to the earl's receiver for his journey and wages (Devon, 347; July 29, 1416; For. Accts. 49, B; Exch. Accts. 328/6, July 29, 1416).

³ Tit. Liv. 28.

⁴ Itin. 427.

⁵ Ibid. 428; Gachard, 233.

⁶ Tit. Liv. 28; Kingsford, Lit. 330.

⁷ Monstr. iii. 147.

⁸ News of the refusal reached Paris on Aug. 11 (Baye, ii. 263 sq.).

⁹ St Denys, vi. 42.

¹⁰ Baye, ii. 266.

¹¹ Ibid. 265; Félibien, iv. 562; Douët d'Arcq, i. 385.

and St Denis, they moved off to Beaumont on the Oise, where they entered the castle of the duke of Orléans, killed the captain, slaughtered the garrison, threw twenty-eight of the townsfolk into the river, and then decamped by the bridge as suddenly as they had come. Later they obtained admission into Nesle, whence they carried off a hundred cartloads of plunder¹. Soon afterwards the duke of Burgundy was declared a rebel².

Meanwhile Sigismund had at last left England. He had been present at a solemn service in Canterbury cathedral to give thanks for the great naval victory³, and his servants quietly let fall along the streets of the city some singular farewell lines in Latin acrostic bidding angelic England rejoice in her glorious victory⁴, and Englishmen felt flattered at the compliment, even though it was flung over the horse's tail⁵. On Aug. 23 the two kings travelled together to Dover⁶, and on the 25th Sigismund and his suite took ship and crossed with a fair wind to Calais⁷, where he was lodged in the Prince's Inn in the Staple buildings⁸.

It had originally been intended that Henry should also cross from Dover⁹, but the naval activity of the French had caused a change in the arrangements, word having been sent to the Cinque Ports to have a strong fleet assembled at Sandwich to convoy the king across by the longer route¹⁰. After Sigismund had sailed Henry therefore betook himself to Sandwich¹¹, where quarters had been prepared for him at the Carmelite

¹ St Denys, vi. 44.

² On Aug. 30 (D. Sauvage, 246).

³ The news reached Henry on Aug. 21. He was on his way to Canterbury from Smallhythe, where he had been on business relating to vessels building there. He rode straight to Canterbury, and the service apparently took place the same day (Gesta, 89 sqq.).

⁴ Gesta, 93; Chron. Giles, 80; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 141; Usk, 130, 315; [E.H.R. xxix. 510 ("An Historical Collection of the Fifteenth Century," ed. Kingsford)].

⁵ "Post caudas equorum suorum projecit," Strecche, 268.

⁶ Basler Chron. v. 164; Reichstagsakten, viii. 124.

⁷ Basler Chron., loc. cit. The date is incorrectly given by many contemporary and modern writers. For a letter of Sigismund's dated Calais, Aug. 26, see Reichstagsakten, vii. 315.

⁸ The Prince's Inn was near the south-west corner of the market-place (Dillon, 303, 305, 320). Some of its rooms had been repaired against the visit of "the Emperor of Germany," and it had been furnished with two new stoves (Exch. Accts. 187/6). For a picture of the Staple buildings, afterwards called the Hôtel de Guise, see Lennel, 13.

⁹ His retinue had been ordered to assemble there by Aug. 19 (Lett. Bk. I. 164; Rym. ix. 376).

¹⁰ Tit. Liv. 29.

¹¹ Documents were dated at Sandwich on Sept. 1, 3, 4 (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 43, 48, 53, 82; Claus. 4 Hen. V, 15; Chanc. Warr. 664/684).

friary¹. The town was crowded with notables. Archbishop Chichele was there², and Bishops Beaufort and Langley, together with Henry Fitzhugh, Gilbert Talbot, John Harington, and many other barons³. Beaufort was lodged at St Clement's vicarage, and as he was crossing with Henry, he handed over the great seal on Sept. 4 to a clerk of the Chancery, John Mapleton⁴, who was to deliver it to Simon Gaunstede, the new keeper of the chancery rolls⁵, in whose custody it was to remain at the Converts' House in London till the chancellor's return. On the same day the duke of Clarence was appointed keeper of the kingdom during the king's absence⁶.

Forty vessels were now ready in the harbour, and about noon on this same day the king went on board⁷. Soon after the fleet sailed, however, the wind dropped, and before long the sailors had to take to their oars in a dead calm. Nevertheless, with the help of the tide, they made the passage in twelve hours. At Calais Sigismund was waiting on the beach; the two kings embraced, and passed up through the town, chatting and joking "as Imperial Highnesses should⁸." It was in a conversation about this time that Sigismund told Henry that he looked upon

¹ On the south-west of the town, between the ramparts and New Street (Hasted, iv. 260, 268; Monast. vi. 157).

² On Sept. 1, in a document dated "in hospitio nostro" at Sandwich, he appointed prior Woodnesburgh, of Christ Church, Canterbury, as his vicar during his absence (Conc. iii. 379).

³ Rym. ix. 385.

⁴ In the subsidy roll of 1412 he appears as owning property in London yielding 40s. a year (Archaeol. Journ. xlv. 75). He was a receiver of petitions for Gascony in the parliament of March, 1416 (Rot. Parl. iv. 70). In 1417 he appears as claiming 10 marks from the estate of Richard Prentys deceased (Claus. 5 Hen. V, 9 d; cf. Wylie, ii. 331, n. 9). He was chancellor of Queen Joan, and at his death in 1432 was rector of Broadwater, near Worthing, where his brass is still to be seen (Antiquary, xviii. 96; Macklin, 147).

⁵ He was appointed on June 3, 1415 (Foss, Judges, iv. 320). On July 4, 1416, he had letters of general attorney for Beaufort, who was going abroad with the king (Rym. ix. 370). Gaunstede had been in the service of the duchy of Lancaster (Wylie, iv. 186; Duc. Lanc. Accts. Various, 27/6). At various times he held prebends of York (Le Neve, iii. 174), Lincoln (ibid. ii. 137), and Chichester (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 125), and in 1418-19 he was made archdeacon of Nottingham (Le Neve, iii. 154). He was a receiver of petitions in the parliaments of 1419 and 1420 (Rot. Parl. iv. 110, 123). For his accounts as keeper of the *Domus Conversorum* from June 3, 1415, to Feb. 9, 1422, during which time he was keeper of the chancery rolls, see Exch. Accts. 251/19 (in a pouch). His will was proved in 1423 (Challoner Smith, i. 220; Hennessy, p. clxi), and his successor as keeper of the rolls was appointed on Oct. 28, 1423 (Foss, Judges, iv. 316). In 1412 he owned property in London yielding £6. 9s. 8d. a year (Archaeol. Journ. xlv. 73).

⁶ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 48.

⁷ Rym. ix. 385; Gesta, 93; Capgrave, de Illustr. 120.

⁸ There is no evidence that Sigismund spoke English, but both he and Henry had a good knowledge of French. Cf. Wylie, iii. 332, 401.

Calais as his greatest jewel¹, and gave him the famous advice that if he wished to secure an easy crossing to France for the recovery of his rights, he must keep both Calais and Dover as sure as his two eyes².

During his six weeks' stay in Calais, King Henry was lodged in the castle³, where a new stone house had been specially built for his suite within the bailey adjoining the north wall⁴. Workmen had been busy for some time past making good the walls and barriers; houses had been new tiled and buildings generally tidied up, so that Sigismund might have a good impression as he passed through the town⁵. Before either Henry or Sigismund had left England, £2000 had been allotted for their household expenses in Calais⁶, and £2894. 13s. 4d. had been paid for wine⁷ and £1000 for salt fish and stockfish⁸ to be ready against the king's arrival. Spices to the value of £200 were bought from Calais merchants⁹. Silks, damasks and arras were sent across¹⁰. There were tents and pavilions draped with cloth of gold¹¹, one of which was arranged as a chapel in front of the castle, and another as a hall¹². Henry took £4000 in cash with him¹³, and an additional 2000 marks were sent over from London on Oct. 4 to meet the expenses of the king's chamber¹⁴. Provision had also to be made for military contingencies: for instance, £280 was paid for saltpetre on Sept. 3¹⁵, and on the 18th order was issued that all who had lately been in the retinue of the duke of Bedford should cross to Calais with all speed¹⁶.

¹ Hym thought it was a jewel most of alle,
And so the same in Latin did it calle.

(Pol. Songs, ii. 192; Pauli-Hertzberg, 54.)

² Pol. Songs, ii. 158; Gesta, 94; Pauli-Hertzberg, 9; D.K.R. xlv. 543. Among those who heard Sigismund give this counsel was probably Walter Hungerford, the steward of the household, who twenty years afterwards read the "Libell" which contains the anecdote, and pronounced it as true as the Gospel (Pol. Songs. ii. 205; Pauli-Hertzberg, 64).

³ The castle was on the north-west side of the town, separated from it by a large ditch; see Sandeman, 30.

⁴ The house was 70 ft. long, 23 wide, and 20 high (Exch. Accts. 187/6).

⁵ Ibid. *i.e.* the account of William Caxton, controller of Calais, dated June 8, 1418, which supplies much valuable material for the history of Calais from 1413 to 1418.

⁶ Exch. Accts. 328/6, Aug. 10, 1416.

⁷ Ibid. July 18, 1416; Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Pasch., June 5, July 23, 1416.

⁸ Ibid. Aug. 10, 1416.

⁹ Ibid. Mich., Nov. 4, 1416.

¹⁰ Devon, 347.

¹¹ Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Pasch., Sept. 3, 1416.

¹² Gesta, 98.

¹³ Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Pasch., Aug. 10, Sept. 3; Devon, 348.

¹⁴ Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., Nov. 4.

¹⁵ Ibid. Pasch., Sept. 3.

¹⁶ Claus. 4 Hen. V, 13 d.

The greater part of the visit was given up to momentous diplomatic negotiations. These were mostly shrouded in mystery, and contemporary writers differ greatly in their guesses as to the real nature of what went on. Some said that Henry had gone across because he was so keen for peace that he would not leave the French the least excuse for continuing the war¹; but such a view is untenable in face of the Canterbury treaty. Others supposed that he went to Calais as a compliment to Sigismund, or perhaps to stimulate the loyalty of the place by a personal visit and "for other matters which he perhaps determined to transact at the same time²." But the presence of the archbishop, the chancellor, the keeper of the privy seal and a full court is evidence that the "other matters" were of supreme moment. The negotiations with France had not been irrevocably broken off, and it may be that the altered position at Harfleur had made the French really anxious to treat for terms. When it was known that Sigismund was about to cross the strait, messengers from Rouen and Abbeville arrived at Boulogne seeking news as to the coming of the king of England³. The French Council instinctively felt that Henry's arrival was a presage of mischief⁴. Nevertheless, it was not long before negotiations were resumed, and though neither Charles nor any exalted substitute for him was expected to appear, the archbishop of Rheims, Gontier Col, and others had reached Calais by Sept. 9 with full instructions to treat further with Henry⁵. They were received with all respect and had interviews with both Henry and Sigismund; but in retaliation for the way in which the English envoys had been treated at Beauvais⁶, neither they nor their suite were permitted to leave their lodgings without special leave. They lived at their own cost, and if one of their servants had to go out to buy provisions he was accompanied by the master of the hostel in which they were quartered⁷. Such studied insult, however, did not prevent business, which was conducted on the English side by Archbishop Chichele, the earl of Dorset, and Rochford, Waterton, and Morgan, the three envoys who had been at Beauvais⁸. The

¹ Wals. ii. 316, Hypodig. 471; Capgrave, 315; Kingsford, Lit. 287.

² Vita, 88.

³ Regnault, 89; Desilles, Inv. Somm. 416.

⁴ For a letter of the dauphin dated Sept. 27, calling upon all to heal divisions and resist the king of England, see Luzarche, 4.

⁵ Rym. ix. 387. Their commission was dated at Paris, Aug. 28 (*ibid.* 398); their safe-conducts were dated Aug. 14 and Sept. 6 (*ibid.* 377, 386).

⁶ "Haec sunt acta suis quia talia sunt data nostris," Elmham, Lib. Metr. 142.

⁷ Gesta, 94; Chron. Giles, 81; Capgrave, De Illustr. 120.

⁸ Rym. ix. 387.

proposals of the French were embodied in a schedule formally addressed to Sigismund as the originator of the effort to restore peace. They offered to re-open the marriage question (which they had previously declined to consider as long as the English were in Harfleur)¹ and to pay down a large sum of money; and should the English not agree, they begged that Sigismund would lend them substantial aid from the Empire or at least send them some message of advice, for they badly wanted peace, or, failing that, a long truce with the restoration of Harfleur. This puzzling memorandum² appears without date or explanation in a volume of the Cotton Collection which has been much damaged by fire and water; it purports to be a supplement to other proposals already communicated³; but unless these went very much further, they had no chance of success. Nevertheless the conversations were continued for some three weeks, until the impending arrival of another visitor rendered advisable the departure of the French. Their passports were indeed drawn up on Sept. 29⁴, before their efforts had yielded any fruit; but on Oct. 1 powers were issued to Chichele and his colleagues to treat more definitely for a truce⁵. The French had come prepared to consent to a truce of a year⁶, but they were unable to obtain more than a short one to last from Oct. 9 to the following Candlemas⁷, and even this trivial achievement is said to have been due to the special intervention of Sigismund⁸. The truce was to apply to the whole sea route from the entrance to the Mediterranean to the coasts of Norway⁹, a special proviso being inserted that no vessel should benefit by it unless the owner or master made a declaration of acceptance and received a certificate from a specially appointed authority in Calais or Boulogne¹⁰. The truce was

¹ Morosini, ii. 118. [Sigismund had throughout had great hopes of a marriage alliance between the rival countries (Finke, Acta, iv. 458).]

² Rym. ix. 387, from Cotton MS. Calig. D. v; nothing of it is now decipherable in MS.

³ "Juxta ea quae verbo et scripto eidem Regiae Majestati plenius communicata fuere," *ibid.*

⁴ D.K.R. xliv. 583. [There is no ground for the suggestion that any secret had been made of the duke of Burgundy's consent to meet Henry and Sigismund. It must have been well known at Constance (Finke, Acta, iv. 465, 471 sq.).]

⁵ Rym. ix. 389, 397. Henry Ware, keeper of the privy seal, was now substituted for the earl of Dorset on the commission.

⁶ Rym. ix. 397.

⁷ *Ibid.* 397, 422; Cal. Dipl. Doc. 318. For order of the duke of Clarence to proclaim this truce (dated Oct. 13, not Oct. 3 as Rym. ix. 402), see Lett. Bk. I. 164.

⁸ Morosini, ii. 116, 122. See letter of the duke of Anjou written in Paris, Oct. 10 (Bouche, ii. 438)

⁹ Rym. ix. 399.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 402.

formally ratified on Oct. 20¹, but it was a hollow sham, which merely covered Henry's preparations for the winter and left him free to pounce with the return of spring. It looks, in fact, as if the English accepted it merely to have a pretext for ending the negotiations and getting rid of the French envoys, for no sooner was it signed than they were escorted over the frontier to the west², just as the duke of Burgundy was approaching Calais from the east.

The duke had not been allowed to forget his acceptance of the invitation to attend the conference at Calais. On Aug. 5 Bishop Caterick, who was about to leave for Constance, was commissioned with two squires to meet his representatives and arrange the details of the interview³. On Aug. 19 they arrived at Lille, where they stayed eight days⁴. It was, however, considered advisable to make provision against a possible failure of the duke to appear in person⁵. The Burgundians in fact were doubtful whether it was wise of their lord to commit himself to the treacherous English; when, as the time of the meeting approached, he moved towards the rendezvous, he kept a large body of troops near at hand; and finally his council demanded that at least two dukes and four earls should be delivered up by the English as hostages for his personal safety. The messengers who presented this proposal at Calais were received most graciously by Henry, who talked them into consenting that the sole pledge should be his brother Humphrey⁶. On Oct. 1 a safe-conduct to hold good for fifteen days was issued in favour of Duke John: he might enter Calais with 800 armed men, while the duke of Gloucester swore that he would remain at Gravelines with the count of Charolais until the duke of Burgundy had actually returned⁷.

At four o'clock on the morning of Oct. 4 Gloucester, accom-

¹ Rym. ix. 404.

² Cf. Tit. Liv. 29: "abire jussi sunt."

³ Rym. ix. 374.

⁴ Itin. 428; Gachard, 233.

⁵ On Aug. 30, Hugh Mortimer, John Hovingham, Philip Morgan and others were authorised to take the duke's homage in case he should not be willing to meet Henry in person. They were to fix the rate of payment that his men would receive if they helped the English. Boulogne, Hesdin, and a third place, the name of which cannot be deciphered, were to be garrisoned in his interest, but would be given up as soon as the towns of Eu, Alençon, and Clermont had been captured. Other points were left for future discussion (Cotton MS. Calig. D. vii. f. 11; the document is only partially legible). [On Aug. 22 Sigismund expected the duke to be in Calais by the end of the month (Finke, Acta, iv. 465). On Sept. 8 it was believed that he would arrive in a few days (ibid. 471).]

⁶ Gesta, 95, 96.

⁷ Rym. ix. 390 sq.; Cousse-maker, 182; Dehaisnes-Finot, i. 319; Brut, ii. 559.

panied by about 800 men, left Calais and passed along the shore to the river Aa, which formed the eastern limit of the English march. They ranged themselves along the bank, while Lord Camoys, Master Henry Ware (keeper of the privy seal), and Robert Waterton went forward into Gravelines to exchange and ratify documents. This done, the duke of Burgundy came out and stood on the French bank; then at a signal both he and the English duke advanced and shook hands in the bed of the stream. Each then passed on, Gloucester being received by the count of Charolais and Burgundy by the earl of Salisbury. The English duke was conducted to St Omer, where he was splendidly entertained, though he wellnigh caused a rupture by an act of rudeness to the count. Meanwhile the duke of Burgundy, escorted by 200 mounted men, rode on to Calais. The earl of Warwick and Sir Thomas Erpingham came out to meet him and conducted him to the hostel that had been prepared for his reception. His first visit was to Sigismund, and much interest was stirred as to the manner in which he would be received, for Sigismund had an old grudge against him over the repayment of the ransom money of Nicopolis, and a far sorer point was the question of the duchy of Brabant, which Sigismund had set his heart on recovering for the House of Luxemburg. But old antipathies on both sides had been previously smoothed: the duke had bound himself to give satisfaction respecting the ransom by a definite date, and his readiness for the interview may have been quickened by recent events at Canterbury. As he came into the imperial presence he bowed twice and would have made a deeper obeisance but that Sigismund stepped forward, embraced him, and set him at his side. After taking spice, they said farewell, and the duke made his way to the castle, where he was received by King Henry with similar ceremonial in the large hall. The two afterwards retired to an inner apartment, where they remained closeted together till nightfall. Three days were spent in discussion, and on Oct. 8 the king entertained the duke at a great banquet in the tent in front of the castle. Then four more days were passed in conferences of the strictest privacy, and on Oct. 13 the duke returned to his own land, the duke of Gloucester was restored¹, and the fate of France was sealed for a generation.

¹ Monstr. iii. 162 sq.; Waurin, ii. 237; Cordeliers, 235; Basler Chron. v. 165; Luzarche, 16; Barante, ii. 67, 70; Gesta, 100 sqq.; Capgrave, 215; Hall, 76; Holinshed, iii. 558.

When Elmham wrote the notes which are our chief guide to these momentous events, he could only say that the outcome of the interview was a mystery¹. Some held that the duke had taken an oath to be Henry's subject²; there was also a rumour that Sigismund had pressed for the marriage of one of the duke's daughters to the duke of Bedford³; but the general belief was that the duke had been playing with the king and that he would prove a double-dealer⁴. We are now, however, in possession of a document which supplies the key to the whole situation⁵. In it the duke declared himself convinced of the justice of Henry's claim to the crown of France and ready to support him in prosecuting it. He acknowledged him as his sovereign, but preferred to postpone his formal homage till some considerable part of France had been conquered. In the meantime he would help him by all secret means, and be ready, as soon as he was called upon, to act openly with all his force, while if for form's sake he should have to make the usual exception about not taking arms against the actual king of France, it would be understood on both sides that such a stipulation really meant nothing. In return for all this treason no recompence whatever appears as having been offered by Henry, but it is stated by a contemporary that the duke was promised a share in the gains of the coming conquest⁶. So scandalous is the whole transaction that it is not surprising that Burgundian chroniclers have shrunk from admitting that the duke really gave his consent to it⁷, though they are constrained to confess that the king and court at Paris had no doubt that the duke had committed himself to an alliance with the king of England⁸. As for modern writers, they have mostly supposed that the document, although footed as "written and signed with our own hand and sealed with the privy seal of our arms at Calais the ——— day of October⁹," was only a draft never actually

¹ Gesta, 103; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 146.

² For this supposition, see Coke, 91, 176.

³ The rumour was current at Venice, Morosini, ii. 118.

⁴ "Scio qui scribo quod opinio populi dat eum tenuisse regem nostrum toto isto tempore in amphiboliis et ambagibus, et sic reliquisse, et quod finaliter more omnium Gallicorum invenietur duplex: unus in publico et alius in occulto," Gesta, 103 sq. Cf. Elmham, Lib. Metr., loc. cit.

⁵ Rym. ix. 395 sq.

⁶ Monstr. iii. 163.

⁷ Ibid.; Waurin, ii. 237.

⁸ Monstr. iii. 164; Waurin, ii. 237; Le Fèvre, i. 284.

⁹ The day of the month is left blank in Rym. ix. 396.

signed¹. But the fact that the duke had sent no help against the English when called upon to do so in the summer of this very year, that he expressly told his officers in Picardy to refuse to act unless they received orders directly from himself, and that he had been entertaining English envoys at Lille and talking over the very details that appear in the document is damning evidence that he was a party to the agreement in spirit², whether he actually put his seal to it or not. Henry's view of the duke's position is revealed in a message which he sent in the summer of 1418 asking the duke how he could explain his conduct in view of the "trewes taken bitwix us and hym³."

The duke, it seems, played false with Sigismund as well as with Charles VI. It is well attested that he did homage to Sigismund for his possessions in the counties of Burgundy and Alost⁴; but no sooner had he left than he entered into negotiations with the estates of Brabant and undertook to defend them against any attempts that Sigismund might make to bring them back into dependence on the Empire⁵.

Immediately after the departure of the duke of Burgundy, there arrived in Calais a messenger from his bitterest enemy, the duke of Anjou⁶; but why he came and what he did we do not know, for the business of the conference was now regarded as ended, and there was a speedy exodus of the leading men concerned in it. Beaufort, the chancellor, had returned to London by Oct. 12⁷, and the king set sail in the early morning of Oct. 16⁸. He and Sigismund took leave of each other on the shore, embracing several times with tears and kisses⁹. Sigismund distributed 1000 crowns among the Englishmen who had formed part of his suite during his visit, each man of gentle blood, we are told, receiving twelve marks and each valet six¹⁰. Handsome presents were given by Henry to all the visitors,

¹ So Barante, iii. 190 ("projet de traité"); Beaucourt, i. 140 ("sous forme de minute"); Kingsford, 175 ("a document ready drafted for signature but not actually signed"); Lenz, 130; Kervyn de Lettenhove, iii. 91.

² Above, p. 20.

³ Delpit, 222; Gesta, 123 n.

⁴ Wals. ii. 317; Nasmith, 350, from "liber magistri Breuster cum Ricardo Beauchamp nobile comite Warwici"; Windecke, 68; Monstr. iii. 163; Waurin, ii. 237.

⁵ Dynter, 324, 770.

⁶ For his safe-conduct, dated Oct. 6, see Rym. ix. 401.

⁷ Rym. ix. 385.

⁸ Basler Chron. v. 165; Nicolas, Navy, ii. 428, whose alternative date, Oct. 9, is certainly wrong.

⁹ Montreuil, 1444.

¹⁰ E.H.R. xxix. 511.

though the English were accused of having been less liberal than the French¹. Henry's passage was tempestuous², but on the 18th he was back at Lambeth³ in readiness for the opening of parliament next day⁴. The chief business was the confirmation and publication of the treaty of Canterbury⁵, so that henceforth the position of the parties concerned could not possibly be misunderstood.

As soon as King Henry had left Calais, there was nothing to justify Sigismund's further absence from Constance. Some initial delay was caused by the emperor's breach with the count of Holland, who now failed to carry out an undertaking to provide ships for the transport of Sigismund and his suite to Dordrecht⁶. An overland journey through Flanders was contemplated, but the mutual suspicions of Sigismund and the duke of Burgundy frustrated the former's efforts to secure a satisfactory safe-conduct⁷. In the end ships were hired at Dordrecht, and, sailing to Calais, took Sigismund's party on board as soon as the prevailing rough weather abated. They put to sea on Oct. 24 accompanied by the duke of Gloucester, Sir John Tiptoft, and other notables; but, although convoyed by four large English ships under the command of Peter Carew, they hugged the shore timidly and took ten days over the voyage⁸. They were met by representatives of the count at Dordrecht, whence the English escort went home, loaded with gifts for themselves and Henry⁹. Sigismund's unwonted liberality, however, had evidently reduced him to grave straits, for he negotiated a loan with some Hanse merchants who happened to be in the town¹⁰, and also sent Eberhard Windecke, the chronicler, to Bruges to see what he could raise on the collar of the Garter, together with some valuable jewels and all the presents that the English had given him at Calais. A handsome amount was secured, including 10,000 crowns on

¹ Montreuil, 1412.

² Kingsford, *Lit.* 330.

³ Brut, ii. 381.

⁴ Rym. ix. 403.

⁵ *Ibid.* 404; Cal. Dipl. Doc. 318; Rot. Parl. iv. 96 sqq.; Reichstagsakten, vii. 295, 337; Gesta, 105; Chron. Giles, 91.

⁶ Windecke, 69; Wagenaar, iii. 406; Aschbach, ii. 165.

⁷ Windecke, 79.

⁸ *Ibid.*; Basler Chron. v. 165; Reichstagsakten, vii. 135; Otterbourne, 278; Wals. ii. 317; Gesta, 104; E.H.R. xxix. 511; Devon, 348.

⁹ Engelbrechtsz, 211; Gesta, 107; [E.H.R. xxix. 511, where it is said that Sigismund sent to the king many precious gifts, including garments of cloth of gold and a unicorn's horn more than six feet long].

¹⁰ Stieda, 64.

the collar, but it was with difficulty that Windecke, after his master's return to Constance, got out of him the money to redeem the pledges¹.

On Nov. 7, after three days in the town, Sigismund and his party left Dordrecht². His departure marks the end of his ambitious attempt to act as arbiter of western Europe. Even now, however, he seemed in no hurry to return to the General Council. He spent eight days at Nymegen, three weeks at Aachen, five days at Cologne, nine at Liége, and fifteen at Luxemburg³. Here he had a conversation with John Tiptoft, who had been despatched by Henry to make arrangements for his co-operation in the approaching campaign in France. Tiptoft was accompanied by Philip Morgan and Hartung van Clux; but, though all three had been commissioned to conduct important diplomatic business at Constance, Tiptoft and Clux went back to England, leaving Morgan to go on alone⁴. The emperor's slow progress hitherto had been partly due to the necessity of trying to compose certain political differences that were vexing the Netherlands and the Rhineland. But when he left Luxemburg on Jan. 21, 1417, he was evidently determined to press forward, for after calling at Metz and Strasbourg, he crossed the Black Forest so quickly that he reached Constance on the 27th⁵. As he rode into the city he had round his neck King Henry's SS collar, which had become part of his customary ceremonial dress⁶, and on the following Sunday he wore the blue mantle of the Garter at High Mass⁷. Two days after his arrival he sent for the members of the English "nation," shook hands with them, and made a speech in which he praised the king and his brothers and commended the whole realm. He had been specially charmed with the way in which divine service was conducted in the English churches; the vestments and ornaments had made him think himself in Paradise: but

¹ Windecke, 82 sq.

² Reichstagsakten, vii. 135; Basler Chron. v. 165; Altmann, i. 136.

³ Reichstagsakten, loc. cit.; Basler Chron. 165 sqq.; Windecke, 69; Hegel, ii. 61; Altmann, i. 136, 138 sq., 140; Dynter, iii. 326.

⁴ Caro, Kanzlei, 128 sq., Bündniss, 86; For. Accts. 51, A, C; Rym. ix. 410 sqq., 436.

⁵ Windecke, 69; Altmann, i. 140; Aschbach, ii. 175; Hardt, iv. 1090; [Finke, Acta, ii. 86].

⁶ "Zowre Livre of the Coler abowte hys necke," Rym. ix. 434; "assidua Angliae regis ordinis seu torquis latione," Montreuil, 1444; "liberatam seu devisam continue deferentis," Rym. ix. 441.

⁷ Rym. ix. 435.

this may have been no more than a piece of the cajolery characteristic of his speeches to ecclesiastics¹.

There has been much discussion of the fruits of Sigismund's enterprise. That Henry intended to make the treaty of Canterbury a working instrument of policy is shown by the fact that on Dec. 2, 1416, he authorised his representatives at Constance, together with John Tiptoft, Philip Morgan, and Hartung van Clux, to approach any of the electors or princes of the Empire and to attach them to his interest by accepting their homage in return for grants of money², as he had recently done with Dietrich von Mörs, archbishop of Cologne, whose predecessors had occupied a similar position in regard to previous kings of England³. In the following August, moreover, Tiptoft, Morgan, and Clux were again in Germany, and apparently remonstrated with Sigismund, then at Constance, on his failure to render military help to the English, extracting from him a promise to be on the French frontier with a large force on May 1, 1418⁴.

As for Sigismund, his purpose in concluding the treaty has been interpreted in every conceivable way. Some have supposed that Henry dominated him by his superior diplomatic skill, and thus in a moment became the arbiter of European politics⁵. Others have regarded the treaty as a non-committal document containing no promise of actual assistance on either side, and that therefore Sigismund looked upon it with

¹ A letter written to Henry by John Forester, who was present, gives an account of what passed (Rym. ix. 434). The writer is probably the same as John Forest or Forst or Forster (Rot. Parl. iv. 494), who was one of the delegates of Archbishop Chichele (Conc. iii. 369). He was archdeacon of Surrey from Aug. 30, 1414, to 1417 (Le Neve, iii. 29), and dean of Wells from 1425 to his death in 1446 (ibid. i. 152; Monast. ii. 283). Cf. for his letter Usk, 315.

² Rym. ix. 412; Cal. Dipl. Doc. 318; Reichstagsakten, vii. 296, 338. Cf. Rym. ix. 437. For £90 sent through Tiptoft to two "milites de Ducheland" at Constance in the spring of 1417 "of the king's gift," see Devon, 351, May 25, 1417.

³ Thus in 1397 Archbishop Frederick of Saarwerden did homage to Richard II and declared himself his vassal in consideration of an annual payment of £1000 (Rym. viii. 2 sqq.; Gall. Christ. iii. 703). He undertook to protect all Englishmen trading with Cologne and to furnish 500 men-at-arms when required for active service with the English king, who would pay all their expenses. Little seems to have come of the compact, and there is no evidence that the allowance was ever paid under Henry IV; but in 1416 the arrangement was renewed (though the fee was now only 1000 nobles), and while Sigismund was in London representatives of the archbishop did homage on his behalf. See Rym. ix. 343, 346, 347, 459; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 191; Devon, 368.

⁴ Caro, Kanzlei, 129, 130, 132, Bündniss, 87.

⁵ This view is favoured, e.g. by Pauli (Bilder, 294, 296), Beaucourt (i. 265), Lindner (ii. 297), Valois (iv. 363).

indifference¹. Others again have thought that, whatever its meaning, Sigismund never had any intention of carrying it out, but signed it to secure an escape from England, where his position was becoming dangerous owing to the refusal of the count of Holland to supply him with ships for his return. This is the view of his own panegyrist², who says that he had to flatter King Henry and sign a number of promises in order to keep on good terms with him and get away quietly; while the French believed that he accepted the treaty as the only means of raising money enough to carry him home³. A modern writer has argued that an alliance with England was vital to the success of the Council of Constance⁴; but England's interest in the union of the Church was not increased by the conclusion of the treaty, nor is there any evidence that it was likely to decline without it. It has also been contended that it was Sigismund who imposed his wishes on Henry, hoping to make use of the power of England in recovering the lost provinces of the Empire⁵ or perhaps even in conquering France herself⁶. Of all these views the last seems to me the most probable. On Sigismund's arrival at Dordrecht he at once wrote to Henry assuring him that he should certainly have his assistance against France, while Henry promised him in return that he would take no step without first informing him of it⁷; and when at Luxemburg in the following January he declared to Tiptoft that he would be on the French borders with a large force by the following midsummer⁸. That he was in earnest⁹ is proved by the fact that on his way back to Constance and at the Council itself he did his best to induce the princes and electors of Germany to take sides with England¹⁰ and wrote to the Genoese in the hope of detaching them from the French alliance, actually

¹ So Bess, *Bündniss*, 654; Stubbs, iii. 93.

² Windecke, 69. Cf. Zeller, vii. 55; Caro, *Bündniss*, 59. Lenz (102) contemptuously rejects this explanation, but Bess (*Bündniss*, 652), while sneering at it as the notion of a "lackey," admits that it may not be far from the truth.

³ Montreuil, 1449; St Denys, vi. 56.

⁴ Caro, *Bündniss*, 61. Cf. A. Leroux, 150.

⁵ Gollut, 1015; Rapin (Tindal), i. 517.

⁶ Lenz, 103; Beaucourt, i. 267; J. Meyer, 248, who adds "utinam totam Galliam imperio unde ablata est valuisset reddere."

⁷ Rym. ix. 427, 430.

⁸ Caro, *Bündniss*, 86.

⁹ For the view that Sigismund was all along sincere, being justly enraged by the deceit and intrigue of the French at Beauvais, see Gierth, 43; Caro, *Kanzlei*, 98, *Bündniss*, 45, 63.

¹⁰ St Denys, vi. 56; Montreuil, 1444; Rym. ix. 607. They all agreed and offered to raise 3000 lances.

persuading them to put two carracks at Henry's disposal¹. On March 22, 1417, he wrote to the French king telling him outright that he had allied himself with England in order to recover the rights of the Holy Empire², and he sent a copy of the treaty to the Count Palatine and other German lords³. On May 2 he formally ratified it at Constance⁴; eleven days later he made a public declaration that he had signed it⁵; and when on June 10 envoys from the Hanse towns were urging him to support a claim for 10,000 marks which they had against England, he broke into a rage and told them that whoever was against his brother was against him too⁶. When Henry was preparing for his invasion of Normandy in 1417, it was commonly believed in Paris that Sigismund was ready to confer the province of Dauphiné on one of Henry's brothers in order to assert his rights over it as part of the old kingdom of Arles⁷. [On April 29, indeed, he entered into a military alliance with the duke of Burgundy, and though the duke would not undertake to aid Sigismund against Charles VI, Sigismund was apparently bound to help the duke against his enemies in France⁸.]

Nevertheless, though he seems honestly to have meant to send 3000 men-at-arms to help the English⁹, he replied with mere promises of what he would do next spring¹⁰ when Henry definitely applied for the "brother's assistance that he hoped to have of him¹¹," and in the end Henry was left to struggle on alone. At Constance, indeed, no one took him seriously, and when he indignantly reproached Pope Martin V for not regarding him as an enemy of France, the pope said that he had always regarded this enmity as an affair of words¹². It is true that in March, 1419, Henry still spoke of his alliance with Sigismund as indissoluble¹³, and that Sigismund, for all his inactivity, never repudiated the treaty of Canterbury, and as late as July, 1420, claimed that his "brotherhood, league, and

¹ Reichstagsakten, vii. 296, 353; Caro, Bündniss, 85, Kanzlei, 134. In St Denys, vi. 56, however, it is stated that the Genoese treated his suggestions with contempt.

² Reichstagsakten, vii. 296, 341; Rym. x. 14.

³ Ibid. ix. 607; cf. Martial de Paris, 40.

⁴ Reichstagsakten, vii. 298, 341.

⁵ Ibid. 344.

⁶ Hansrecesse, vi. 431.

⁷ Ordonnances, x. 414.

⁸ [For the text of the treaty, see Finke, iv. 479 sqq. It is summarised by Valois, iv. 378.]

⁹ Rym. ix. 607; Reichstagsakten, vii. 353.

¹⁰ Caro, Bündniss, 87, Kanzlei, 132.

¹¹ In July, 1417, Caro, Kanzlei, 129; Rym. ix. 430.

¹² Ibid. 569.

¹³ Ibid. 710 sq.

confederacy" with the king of England was an actual fact¹. But in reality the treaty achieved nothing, and proved no compensation for his failure to approve himself the arbiter of Europe and the peace compellor between France and England. He had taken his ambition very seriously, and was deeply chagrined at the fruitlessness of his mission². He had, however, no one to blame but himself. He had over-estimated his power of handling an exceedingly delicate problem, and in trying to play off one side against the other, he had over-reached himself. He made himself distrusted and hated by the French, who pursued him with an outburst of venomous scurrility³. In England, it must be admitted, while his oddities excited laughter⁴, his boisterous geniality won him popular favour, which was increased by the prevalent belief that he and the king were kindred spirits⁵. But though he was liked, there is no indication that he was much respected or that his visit made a deep impression on men's minds. Stories of his visit to England are singularly scarce, especially when one reflects that no mediaeval emperor had ever come to the country before. In fact, the most notable memento of Sigismund's stay in England is his sword, which is now one of the insignia of the corporation of York⁶.

¹ Rym. x. 14.

² See e.g. Caro, Kanzlei, 111; Goldast, Stat. i. 148; Gesta, 104; Rym. x. 14; Korner, 394; Persona, 222.

³ Montreuil, 1443-52 passim; St Denys, vi. 34, 56; Boulay, v. 317; Beaucourt, i. 268, quoting Preuves des Libertez de l'Église Gallicane, i. 129.

⁴ Montreuil, 1452.

⁵ "Nunquam major erat amor aut affectio regum," Elmham, Lib. Metr. 146; "nam similis similem sequitur," *ibid.*; "qui alternas prosperitates ut fratres uterini in opinione omnium ambierunt," Gesta, 89. Cf. Vita, 89; Chron. Giles, 77; Bekynton, i. 247; Rym. ix. 435, 710 sq.

⁶ When Sigismund was admitted to the Order of the Garter, his sword, helmet, and crest were, in accordance with custom, fixed above his stall. At his death they were taken down and, together with his mantle (Ashmole, Hist. 495 sq.), offered at the altar when Mass was sung for his soul. The helmet and crest had disappeared, but after the Mass the sword became the perquisite of the dean of St George's, who sold it to Master Harry Hunslop, a canon of Windsor, who on May 5, 1439, presented it to his native city of York. When Hunslop bought it, the sword had a scabbard covered with ruby-coloured velvet on which red dragons were worked in silk, but a new scabbard was provided for it in 1478 and again in 1580. When it was refurbished up in 1586 the mayor had an inscription put upon the blade recording the origin of the sword—*Sigismundi imperat' M.C. Éb. 1439 ornat. Henri May Maior. 1586*—and the records of the city leave no doubt that the claim was justified and that the sword is the very weapon worn by Sigismund at his installation (Jewitt-Hope, ii. 447 sq.; Drake, 362, 365).

CHAPTER L

HENRY'S SECOND EXPEDITION: PREPARATIONS

WHILE the king was at Sandwich on his way to Calais he had issued writs¹ for a parliament to meet at Westminster on Oct. 19, 1416, and, as we have seen, he was back just in time for the opening. Thirty-seven temporal lords were summoned, those appearing for the first time being the earl of Northumberland, who had just been restored to his grandfather's title, and the earls of Dorset and Arundel, the latter's first appearance being also his last². Of the judges William Skrene drops out, and is replaced by a north-countryman, John Strangways³. Of the writs summoning the commons only three have been preserved: one contains the names of the knights of the shire for Rutland, the second the names of the two burgesses returned by Dunwich, and the third those of the four representatives of London⁴.

The king was present at the opening in the Painted Chamber on Oct. 19⁵. After he had taken his seat on a stepped couch, the chancellor, Bishop Beaufort, addressed the assembly on the text "Study to be quiet⁶." He drew attention to the fact that though the king had been less than four years on the throne, this was his sixth parliament. God had rested after six days, and so must their earthly lord⁷. The last five parliaments had been one long struggle for peace, constantly thwarted by the

¹ Dated Sept. 3, Rept. Dign. Peer, iv. 835 sqq.

² Cf. vol. ii. 71 sq. His claim was challenged by John Mowbray, Earl Marshal, who was a son of a sister of the late earl (*ibid.* 71; Rot. Parl. iv. 441; Doyle, ii. 582). Hence arose a famous suit, which dragged along for seventeen or eighteen years, during which the title was in abeyance. In the meantime both claimants died, the tomb of John Lord Matravers, who died in 1421, being still to be seen in the choir of Arundel church. In 1433 the dispute was settled in favour of his son John (Rot. Parl. iv. 443; Cotton, Abridg. 610; Dugd. i. 322; Report Dign. Peer, i. 426); but a re-echo of it early in the nineteenth century led to the compilation of the famous report on "the Dignity of a Peer of the Realm."

³ From Whorlton in Cleveland. He is known to have been a friend of Hotspur (Ord. Priv. Co. i. 151, 152), and became a serjeant-at-law in 1411 (Foss, Judges, iv. 361).

⁴ Return Parl., App. p. xx, i. 288; Letter Bk. I. 158.

⁵ Rot. Parl. iv. 94, 104; Stat. ii. 196; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 143, 147; Chron. Lond. 105; Otterbourne, 278.

⁶ 1 Thess. iv. 11.

⁷ Rot. Parl. iv. 94.

Frenchmen's pride, and this one must be final. The wise man had said that we make war to have peace, and as all treaties with France had failed, peace could only be procured by taking refuge in God's justice and the arbitrament of the sword¹. After this speech the commons withdrew to the refectory of the abbey, and on Oct. 21 they presented as their speaker Roger Flower of Oakham², who had twice been sheriff of Rutland³ and had six times before represented the shire in parliament⁴. It was of course the need of money which had caused the summons of this parliament. It showed as much generosity as could reasonably be expected, granting two tenths and two fifteenths, three-quarters of which was to be payable next Candlemas and the remainder at the following Martinmas—Nov. 11, 1417⁵. Again, however, it was found necessary to exempt Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland⁶, and evidence of declining zeal is seen in the stipulation made that no more money should be asked for before the second instalment of the grant now voted became due, and that there should be no requests for prepayment in the meantime⁷. The dukes of Clarence, Bedford, and Gloucester made a joint declaration that in case Henry should die before Martinmas, 1417, the terms should be strictly carried out, while parliament undertook that the last payment should certainly not be deferred beyond that date.

Apart from the question of money, the only important matter brought before parliament was the treaty of Canterbury. Only two statutes worthy of mention were enacted, one being a stringent re-assertion of the principle that no Irishman should hold an Irish benefice, and the other laying down that masters were not to be fined for paying wages to their farm-servants in excess of the scale fixed by the Statute of Cambridge in 1388⁸.

Parliament was dissolved on Nov. 18⁹. On that day the king bestowed the title of duke of Exeter, with £1000 a year for himself and his heirs, on his uncle Thomas Beaufort, earl

¹ Gesta, 106.

² Rot. Parl. iv. 94; Return Parl. i. 303. Cf. Fifty English Wills, 55; J. Wright, Rutland, 97, 136.

³ Sheriffs' List, 112.

⁴ Return Parl. i. 253, 259, 263, 267, 282, 284.

⁵ Rot. Parl. iv. 95. For estimate that in 4 Hen. V, the fifteenths from all England yielded £37,930. 0s. 6½d. "en clere," without collectors' expenses (£322. 6s. 8d.), see Lansdowne MS. 762, Art. 3.

⁶ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 53.

⁸ Stat. ii. 197 sq.; Rot. Parl. iv. 102.

⁷ Rot. Parl. iv. 95.

⁹ Ibid. 96, 113.

of Dorset¹, though to many this seemed but a poor return for his great services at Harfleur². The position of the new duke was not altogether easy, for the son of the last holder of the title, who had been attainted and beheaded seventeen years before, had likewise, as earl of Huntingdon, rendered signal service throughout the French campaign, and had a strong claim to be restored to his father's rank and name. His lands were to be granted to him when he came of age on March 29, 1417³. It was perhaps understood that the title was not to pass to Beaufort's heirs⁴; but it is another proof of the commanding personal influence of the king that the transaction did not lead to renewed intrigue and rebellion.

The convocation of Canterbury met on Nov. 9, and granted two tenths to be paid within a year⁵. On Nov. 13 writs were issued for the northern convocation to meet before the next Epiphany⁶. It assembled on Jan. 5, 1417, and after voting a tenth, dispersed on Jan. 12⁷.

Parliament and the convocations had thus provided the king with the money needed for his contemplated campaign in France. To do him justice, he employed some of his new resources in discharging old obligations. Thus the 10,000 marks which the city of London had advanced for the Agincourt campaign⁸ were repaid on Nov. 4, 1416⁹. Further, on Dec. 6, 1416, the sheriffs were ordered to summon to the Exchequer all persons who still held valuables in pawn for the payment of the second quarter's wages in the expedition of 1415¹⁰. If ready money could not be found to meet all claims, the custody of lands in ward was sometimes offered as an alternative¹¹; but on March 9 such resources were apparently failing, for there was issued a peremptory order that all pledge-holders should come to a reasonable agreement¹².

¹ Rot. Parl. iv. 96; Dugd. ii. 125; Claus. 4 Hen. V, 10; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 50, 53.

² Wals. ii. 317.

³ Rot. Parl. iv. 100, 110.

⁴ Doyle, i. 710.

⁵ Conc. iii. 377; Usk, 130, 316; Wals. ii. 317; Duck, 75; Wake, 352; Rec. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., Mar. 5, 1417, 5 Hen. V, Mich., Oct. 10, 1417.

⁶ For payments to messengers, see Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., Nov. 17, 1416; Claus. 4 Hen. V, 10 d.

⁷ Wake, 353, 411; Kitchin, Records, 135; Conc. iii. 380; Anc. Corr. lvii. 41; Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., Jan. 29, 1417.

⁸ Vol. i. 474.

⁹ Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich.

¹⁰ Rym. ix. 416.

¹¹ e.g. on May 1, 1416, Henry Lord Fitzhugh had returned pledged jewels on receiving the custody of lands of John Lord Lovel, deceased (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 37).

¹² Memoranda Roll, Hilary 4 Hen. V, m. 33; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 225, 228.

Meanwhile, the possibility of peace was not altogether forgotten. Very soon after Sigismund had left a change came over the feelings of the leading French prisoners in England¹. Baulked of their release through the unexpected obduracy of the count of Armagnac, they began seriously to reconsider their position. To all previous overtures on his part the English king had affixed the condition that they should recognise him as their lawful sovereign. Hitherto they had refused², but the French defeat in the Seine had completely altered the outlook, and on Henry's return from Calais the duke of Bourbon asked for an interview, which took place in strict privacy, no one being present besides the parties and Richard Dereham, long a confidential agent of the English court³. The duke said that after repeated messages had passed between himself and his friends at home, he had come to take a new view of Henry's

¹ The most notable were the dukes of Orléans and Bourbon, the counts of Vendôme and Eu, Arthur of Richemont, the famous Marshal Boucicaut, and the lords of Gaucourt and Estouteville. References to them are numerous in the records of the time. See Rym. ix. 318 sqq., 326, 327, 442; D.K.R. xlv. 577, 578, 590; and for the names of persons entitled to the ransoms of prisoners, see Nicholas, App. 61. Whatever may have been asserted in France as to the hardships they were enduring (St Denys, vi. 46; Beaucourt, i. 436), their captivity was not rigorous. They had their coursers, hawks, and hounds (Rym. ix. 320 sq., 337; Huillard-Bréholles, Rançon, 42), their varlets, barbers, falconers, and chaplains (Rym. ix. 326, 327, 331, 336, 337). They visited the king at Eltham, Windsor, Westminster, the Tower, and elsewhere, and state beds were specially prepared for them with sheets of Champagne linen, silken fringes and other costly appointments, while the necessary expenses for their upkeep include payments for bread, beef, mutton, fish, wine, beer, spices, wax, candles, rushes, litter, fuel, and the hire of horses, carts, and boats (Devon, 353; Exch. Accts. 48/1, 406/29; Add. MS. 24,513, f. 13). When the weather changed they got sumpter-loads of cloth, summer gowns, and other articles of comfort and luxury sent across from France (Rym. ix. 321; Piton, 542); and it is remarkable that before they had been three days in London the shops were supplying them with cloth of gold at fancy prices (Riley, Mem. 622). They were given opportunities for recreation and sport (Orig. Lett. Ser. i. i. 2; Nichols, Autographs, 3, 4; Tit. Liv. 99). At least one formed a liaison with an English girl, by whom he had a son who afterwards cut some figure in French history as the Bastard of Vendôme (Pétigny, i. 329; Anselme, i. 323). The cost of food for the ordinary French prisoner was from 3s. 4d. to 4s. a week (Rym. ix. 318), but for the important men under consideration such sums as 7s. 10d., 13s. 4d., or even 20s. a day were not regarded as out of the question (Rym. ix. 318; Rot. Parl. iv. 436; Devon, 450; Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 77, iv. 44, 51; J. Stevenson, Wars, ii. 419). Every facility for raising their ransoms was given them; messengers were allowed to cross to and from France in their service, and not seldom a prisoner was permitted to visit France and try to make his own arrangements (Rym. ix. 319, 320, 326, 327, 331, 337, 422, 442 sqq. et al.; D.K.R. xlv. 576 et passim; Kal. and Inv. ii. 97; Devon, 361; cf. *infra*, p. 40). Nevertheless, all save two of those named above were still prisoners at Henry's death. The exceptions were Arthur of Richemont, who in 1420 was allowed to return to France on terms to be described below (pp. 217sq.), and Marshal Boucicaut, who died at Methley on June 29, 1421 (Exch. Accts. 49/17; For. Accts. 56, E v°).

² "Thai myght ne cowd not Answer," Rym. ix. 428.

³ Wylie, iii. 351.

claim to the throne of France. He had been given to understand that the English king might perhaps renounce that claim, provided that he were assured of the immediate possession of all the lands specified in the treaty of Brétigny, with the addition of Harfleur¹. This he considered to be a "great and reasonable proffer" and speaking in the name of all the leading prisoners, he declared that if he might cross to France, he would do his best to get it accepted there. He was willing to leave his two sons and other hostages in England² and to find merchants who would give security to the amount of 200,000 crowns for his prompt return³. For himself, he said that if the French king would not agree to the terms proposed, he would do homage to Henry, merely stipulating that his promise should be kept secret, at least until his return, or his life might be in danger. He hinted not obscurely that most of the other prisoners were disposed to take the same view. Henry at once agreed that he might go as soon as suitable merchants could be found to stand bail, and with the interview fresh in his mind, he wrote to Tiptoft, who had been sent on an errand to Sigismund, instructing him to inform the emperor of what was on foot, promising further news as events progressed, and showing the conditions under which the duke would start⁴. He was to be accompanied by the lord of Gaucourt, who was authorised to speak on behalf of the duke of Orléans⁵ and Marshal Boucicaut, who shared Bourbon's opinions. It was widely believed not only that the release of the prisoners was near at hand but also that a lasting peace with France was likely to follow. Yet on the very day on which their safe-conducts were drawn up, Henry was so shameless as to write to Tiptoft, "I wol not leve my voyage for any Tretee that they make⁶." In the event, the duke of Bourbon seems not to have crossed, probably owing to

¹ Rym. ix. 428.

² For documents relating to his release, his son Louis being left as a hostage, see Harl. MS. 4763, f. 174 b; Cotton MS. Tiberius, B. xii. ff. 143 b-148.

³ Rym. ix. 426.

⁴ The letter was dated Jan. 25, 1417, Rym. ix. 425 sqq. It is doubtful whether Sigismund ever saw it (see above, p. 31).

⁵ For servants of the duke of Orléans crossing from England to France (safe-conduct of May 10, 1417), see Rym. ix. 453.

⁶ Rym. ix. 430 (Jan. 25). [The word "treetee" is almost certainly used in the sense of "negotiations," as it generally was at this time (cf. Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 255, 257, 260). It was no more "shameless" for Henry to continue his operations than it was for the Allies to go on fighting in November, 1918, while the terms of the Armistice were being considered by the Germans.]

the difficulty of finding satisfactory securities, but Gaucourt really did go, after the dukes of Bourbon and Orléans had given bail in the sum of 40,000 crowns that he would be back by March 31¹.

While these transactions were in progress, measures were taken for the prolongation of the truce signed in the autumn at Calais. On Jan. 18, 1417, William Bardolph, lieutenant of Calais, and two others² were authorised to extend it for six weeks or two months; ten days later safe-conducts were issued for three French envoys to come to Calais³; and there seems to have been no difficulty in arranging that it should continue till March 15⁴. No further agreement seems to have been made before that date; but the truce was apparently maintained by tacit consent. On March 12, Henry Ware, William Bardolph, and Ralph Rochford were appointed to resume negotiations for peace⁵; they left London on March 23⁶, and in April met at Calais three French envoys—the archbishop of Rheims, Guillaume Seignet, and Gontier Col—who had come by sea from Dieppe⁷. It was expressly stated by Henry that these efforts after peace had been much helped by a letter previously written by the count of Holland⁸. Their outcome, however, is not known; apparently they were wholly abortive.

In England the winter passed quietly. The king, except for a visit of several weeks to Kenilworth⁹, where he spent Christmas, remained in or near London¹⁰. Meanwhile preparations for the new expedition were being pressed forward. The need for ready cash was as usual met by borrowing, and the pledges that had recently been redeemed seldom remained in the king's hands for long. Thus, on Jan. 8, 1417, the Pusan collar, which had been returned in the previous May before the repayment of the loan for which it was a security, was taken out of the

¹ Rym. ix. 424, 425, 426; Anc. Corresp. lvii. 79—a letter which Mr Kingsford is certainly wrong in ascribing to 1416 (Lit. 216).

² John Pickering and Thomas Stephens, canon of Exeter (Rym. ix. 422; Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., 18 Jan. 1417).

³ Rym. ix. 432.

⁴ Ibid. 438.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Exch. Accts. 321/34.

⁷ For their safe-conducts, dated April 3, 1417, see Rym. ix. 445. Ware was back in London by May 9, Exchequer, L.T.R., Misc. Enrolled Accts. 6/16.

⁸ Rym. ix. 438.

⁹ He arrived before Dec. 18, 1416, and stayed till late in January (Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., Dec. 17 and 18, 1416; Otterbourne, 278; Wals. ii. 317; Chanc. Warr. 1364/22-28).

¹⁰ The Chancery and Council records all point to this conclusion.

Jewel House to raise 5000 marks from the citizens of London¹; jewels and a Spanish sword were handed to them as security for a further loan of 10,000 marks on March 8²; while to Bishop Beaufort, who lent 21,000 marks, Henry pledged the crown³. The public revenues were of course used for the same purpose. On March 3 the Londoners lent 5000 marks on the security of half the subsidy in the port of London⁴; Bristol advanced 1000 marks on the security of the customs there⁵; while Bishop Beaufort's loan was, if possible, to be repaid from the customs at Southampton⁶. These transactions were but a few among many. Urgent letters under the privy seal were sent out, pressing for immediate loans in cash wherever money was to be found⁷. A supply of ready money was kept up by constant loans at short notice, and the rolls are full of entries of small and large sums borrowed from abbots, priors, parsons, cities, towns, guilds, and private individuals. There is evidence that the peremptory tone of the king's requests for aid caused some resentment⁸, but it must be said on Henry's behalf that at the last parliament the commons had implicitly and the lords expressly approved his action⁹ and that most of the short-date loans were punctually repaid¹⁰. The security usually offered for

¹ Rec. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., Jan. 8.

² Ibid. Mar. 8; Sharpe, *London and the Kingdom*, i. 261. 5000 marks were repaid on Oct. 4, 1417 (Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Mich., Oct. 4).

³ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 112; Rot. Parl. iv. 111; Gesta, 106 n.

⁴ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 67; Letter Bk. I. 176. [Since Dr Wylie's death Professor R. A. Newhall has published his important book, *The English Conquest of Normandy, 1416-1424*. In Chap. IV of that work he investigates the financial side of Henry's enterprise. On the revenue of the year 1416-17 his statements are of much the same tenor as Dr Wylie's. He says, however, that on March 8 a second sum of 5000 marks was borrowed from London (p. 145, n. 7, citing Iss. Roll 629, *i.e.* 4 Hen. V, Mich., Mar. 19, 1417).]

⁵ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 111.

⁶ Gesta, loc. cit.

⁷ Ibid.; E.H.R. xxix. 511 sq.

⁸ Ibid. 511.

⁹ Rot. Parl. iv. 95.

¹⁰ Towns lending small sums, averaging about £20, were Windsor, Newbury, Thame, Reading, Henley, Shaftesbury, Wallingford, Wantage, Abingdon (£60), Bath, Salisbury, Canterbury, Devizes, Witney, Sandwich, Bridgewater, Northampton, and Derby (£82). Larger loans are entered from the cathedral chapters of Wells and Salisbury, from the abbots of Abbotsbury, Abingdon, Dorchester, Glastonbury, Hales, Malmesbury, Netley, Osney, Reading, Shaftesbury, and Woburn, from the priors of Bath, Bradenstoke, Bruton, Montacute, Southwick, and Wallingford, and from the guilds of Corpus Christi and the Trinity at Coventry. All these transactions appear in Rec. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., Jan. 29, Feb. 4, March 8, 1417, and Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 3, 6, 8, 14, 24, March 11, 18. For the repayment of £503. 13s. 4d. lent by the town of Nottingham and various persons in Leicestershire and Lincolnshire, see Devon, 350, April 21, 1417. The bishop of Ely lent £100 and the bishop of Lincoln £200, both sums being repaid in 1419 (Iss. Roll 7 Hen. V, Pasch., May 27, 1419).

these loans was the half-tenth and half-fifteenth due next Martinmas; but the money voted by parliament seems to have been collected with unwonted expedition, some of the instalments not really due till the following November having come in as early as April 6¹. The pressure of work at the Exchequer must have been very severe. It stands recorded in the rolls that 3282 writs, each with its separate seal, were sent out from the Exchequer between April 12 and July 7², and this was apparently not quite the busiest time. It is no wonder that bonuses for overtime were granted to many members of the staff, besides special rewards to the collectors for their extra zeal³.

In February alone £77,242 came into the Exchequer, while on March 8 £8557 more was received. From the occurrence of these large sums, a modern investigator has been led to infer that the receipts for this term reached "the highest sum of any term in the reign," the estimate being that the receipts for this half-year alone—i.e. from Michaelmas, 1416, to Easter, 1417—amounted to £134,000 as compared with an average of £142,500 for a whole year's gross receipt⁴, while the expenditure for the half-year is given as £119,072, as against an average yearly expenditure of £122,000⁵. But the inference may be safely disregarded. The king was always pressing for the proceeds of taxation before they were actually due; and it must be remembered that the totals given are estimates only and not based upon an actual enumeration. Both outgoings and receipts, moreover, are fictitiously swollen by the entry of short loans and of repayments, which sometimes followed within a few days.

As fast as the money came in, it was allotted to the preparations for the coming campaign. Before the end of 1416, numerous lords, knights, and squires had been approached

¹ Rec. Roll 5 Hen. V, Pasch., April 21, 1417 et passim.

² Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Pasch., July 15, 1417.

³ e.g. £5 was granted to the collectors of London, and proportionate amounts to the officials of other ports (Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Mich., Dec. 15, 1417).

⁴ Ramsay, i. 243, 316.

⁵ Antiquary, viii. 99. To the half-year's expenditure, according to Ramsay, must be added £108,830 to make the total for the year £227,902. [Professor Newhall's estimate (p. 144, n. 3) of the total revenue for the year 1416-17 (Easter to Easter) is £216,868, of which £101,893 came in taxes from the laity, £34,837 in taxes from the clergy, and £23,425 in loans. He estimates the expenditure for the same period as £256,885, of which £97,483 went to the royal household, and £81,185 was spent on maintaining the conquests of 1415.]

with a view to the securing of their services¹, and Jan. 12, 1417, was fixed as the date by which they were to supply information as to how many men they could put into the field². Feb. 14 was then named as the day on which they should come before the Council and sign indentures³. On Feb. 1 the sheriffs of London were ordered to make a return of the number of archers and men-at-arms that the city could furnish⁴. On Feb. 9 all London knights belonging to the king's retinue were ordered to present themselves before the Council at the Black Friars⁵. On March 11 more than £30,000 was paid over at the Exchequer to leaders who had signed indentures, and on the same day a payment of £1933 was made for 400 Lancashire and Cheshire archers who were serving in the king's retinue⁶. Gascon crossbowmen had already arrived from Bayonne⁷. But the preparations, as usual, took longer than had been expected. At one time, it seems, the muster of the army at Southampton was fixed for Feb. 18; it was then postponed for a month⁸; but so absurdly sanguine was even this arrangement that the earl of Salisbury, who was ordered to go in advance to Harfleur to assist in meeting any emergency that might arise there, found less than half his force at Southampton on March 19, the appointed muster day⁹.

Meanwhile munitions and stores were being assiduously collected. Thus, master craftsmen were specially brought over from St Sever to make steel crossbows¹⁰; arrowheads were ordered in England¹¹; and on Feb. 10, 1417, the sheriffs were

¹ For payment of messengers despatched for this purpose with writs under the privy seal, see *Iss. Roll* 4 Hen. V, Mich., Dec. 18, 1416.

² *Rym.* ix. 433.

³ *Iss. Roll* 4 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 6, 1417; *Rym.* ix. 433 sq.; *Lett. Bk.* I. 175. For the indenture of the duke of Clarence, signed Feb. 8, see *Rym.* ix. 545; for that of John Lord Clifford of Skipton, with fifty men-at-arms and 150 archers, signed on the same day, see Whitaker, *Craven*, 316.

⁴ Sharpe, *London and the Kingdom*, i. 261.

⁵ Riley, *Mem.* 645.

⁶ *Iss. Roll* 4 Hen. V, Mich., March 11, 1417. [On signing their indentures, captains usually received a quarter's wages—in some cases two quarters—for themselves and their men (Newhall, *op. cit.* 191 sq.).]

⁷ Under the lord of St Pierre (near St Jean de Luz, Basses Pyrénées) and Menauton de Sainte Marie: see order dated Dec. 31, 1416, in *Chanc. Warrants*, Ser. I, 1364/22. [Cf. Newhall, 191, n. 2.]

⁸ *Claus.* 4 Hen. V, 6, 7; *Cal. Pat.* 1416-22, p. 85.

⁹ Salisbury undertook to furnish 100 men-at-arms and 300 archers (*Tit. Liv.* 32); but only 27 men-at-arms and 190 archers were ready, and most of these belonged to other retinues (*Cal. Pat.* 1416-22, pp. 74 sq.; Bréquigny, 7).

¹⁰ *Chanc. Warr.*, Ser. I, 1364/22.

¹¹ *Cal. Pat.* 1416-22, p. 82; *Iss. Roll* 4 Hen. V, Mich., March 18, 1417.

instructed to have six of the wing feathers plucked from every goose, except breeders, and to have them packed and forwarded to London for winging arrows¹. Enormous quantities of corn and gammons of bacon "without number" were collected², though an attempt to get corn from the Baltic was unsuccessful, all export of grain from ports belonging to the Teutonic Order having been prohibited owing to the bad harvest³.

The delay in the start of the expedition was largely due to the difficulty of securing adequate shipping. The king's ships of course were few⁴. In February officers were appointed to requisition vessels in every port for the shipment of troops⁵; but it proved necessary to allot many of the ships furnished by the west and south to Thomas Carew, Pons lord of Castillon, and John Mortimer, who were commissioned to keep the sea for six months with a force of more than 600 men-at-arms and 1200 archers. They undertook to safeguard the sea until the autumn, making war not only on the shipping of France, but on that of Castile, Scotland, and Genoa, unless they received express instructions to the contrary⁶. They appear to have performed their task with zeal, for a letter dated London, May 7, mentions that sixty vessels were "in the strait," where Carew and his fellows were not suffering any enemy to pass⁷, and in the early summer they captured four Spanish ships with valuable cargoes⁸.

The necessity of maintaining so large a force to keep the seas compelled Henry to hire ships from abroad, the principal source being the Netherlands⁹. From lists that remain we are able to make out the names of about 120 of these vessels, of which ninety-one are called cogs, fourteen crayers, six ships, two busses, and two balingers, the rest being very small craft.

¹ Rym. ix. 436; E.H.R. xxix. 512.

² Ibid.; cf. Rym. ix. 437; Claus. 4 Hen. V, 7.

³ Hansrecesse, vi. 362.

⁴ See vol. ii. 378.

⁵ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 208.

⁶ Ibid.; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 85, 141; Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., *passim*; For. Accts. 1 Hen. VI, E. Carew's muster roll is extant, and shows that he had in his own retinue 311 men-at-arms and 656 archers, the names of all being recorded. They were carried on eleven vessels, the largest being a carrack which took 208, the smallest a barge which had only twelve (Exch. Accts. 48/14). Pons of Castillon and Mortimer were each to have 150 men-at-arms and 300 archers (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 85).

⁷ Alart, i. 12 b.

⁸ Exch. Accts. 48/12, 13. The spoil included forty-eight barrels of iron, wool in "pokes," and one hundred carcasses of salt beef.

⁹ For commission of Henry Clitherowe to hire ships in Holland and Zealand, see Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 15, 1417.

Goes supplied twenty-seven, Haarlem twenty-one, Dordrecht fourteen, Rotterdam thirteen, Middelburg twelve, Bergen-op-Zoom five, and a few other towns furnished yet smaller contingents. The first of these vessels was not engaged until Feb. 21 —three days after the date originally fixed for the muster at Southampton¹. There are still to be read indentures and receipts given by twenty-three of the masters. One of these documents refers to a crayer of one hundred tons portage, manned by six seamen and one paget; the rest concern cogs of much smaller capacity, ranging from forty to eighty tons portage. A master's pay was 6*d.* a day, a seaman's 3*d.* with a bonus (*regardum*) of 6*d.* a week, and a paget's 1½*d.* a day. The engagements recorded, which begin at various dates from March to June, were all to terminate on Sept. 1 or 21, 1417. All the men received instalments of pay at London or Southampton, but an unpaid balance remained unsettled for several years².

Venetian trading ships were forcibly pressed into service. Payment was offered in the usual way, but refused by the masters³, who at once wrote to the Signory. Thereupon a resolution was passed in the Venetian Senate that an envoy should be sent to France and England to protest that they had not consented to the employment of their ships in the English service⁴. As no one, however, would undertake the mission the Senate had to be content with sending letters; and it is not surprising that the French regarded the presence of Venetians among the English forces as evidence of unfriendliness on the part of their government, and attacked Venetian commerce on the high seas whenever occasion offered⁵. The unrewarded punctiliousness of the Venetians was not imitated by the Genoese, who readily agreed to the chartering of six of their merchantmen for 10,000 gold crowns⁶.

Early in March a number of ships had collected in the Thames, and £900 had already been paid to their crews in wages⁷. On March 9 all ships in the king's service were

¹ Exch. Accts. 48/15.

² Ibid. 48/28-49/9.

³ Morosini, ii. 130; Ven. State Papers, i. 58.

⁴ Ibid.; Perret, i. 128.

⁵ Ven. State Papers, i. 58 sq.; Morosini, ii. 154.

⁶ Ibid. 128.

⁷ Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., March 11, 13, and 19.

ordered to be at Southampton on April 15¹. By this time troops were assembling there, for on March 26 £83,000 was sent down from London for wages under a guard of mounted archers. Of this sum £24,000 was paid at Salisbury to the king's retinue, and the rest was taken to Southampton for the forces there². It was clearly to the interest of the authorities to transport the troops as soon as possible. First, however, the date for the assembling of the ships was postponed to May 1, then to May 10³, then to May 20 “without any fail⁴.” It did indeed seem as though a start might soon be made when on Hock Tuesday, April 27, the king rode in from Westminster to St Paul's, where he made an offering, and then passed through London saying farewell to small and great and asking for their prayers. The mayor accompanied him across the bridge to St George's church, where he made another offering, and then he went his way⁵. Nevertheless another three months were wasted while Henry moved about from place to place in the south, visiting, for instance, Reading in May, and Salisbury, Bishop's Waltham, and Titchfield in June and July⁶. It was not until the last days of July that he left inland regions for good, but then signs of an imminent start began to multiply. On July 21 he made what may be called his second will⁷;

¹ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 230.

² Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Pasch., July 15, 1417.

³ Ibid. 4 Hen. V, Mich., March 17, 1417.

⁴ Ibid. 5 Hen. V, Pasch., May 3, 1417. Strecche (271 b) says that large numbers of ships had assembled at Portsmouth about May 6.

⁵ First Life, 77; Brut, ii. 382; Kingsford, Lit. 303.

⁶ Chanc. Warr., Ser. 1, 666/821-848, 1364/29; Exch. Accts. 187/10.

⁷ It is written in English and lacks the customary pious phraseology, being limited to business details. Henry confirms all the provision of the will made before the expedition of 1415 (cf. vol. i. 539 sqq.), but he concerns himself mainly with the Lancaster property, with which Archbishop Chichele and others had been enfeoffed on July 22, 1415 (ibid. 543). This arrangement was to stand, but Henry expressed a wish that the feoffees would re-enfeoff him with the estates in question if he should desire it in a subsequent will. Inasmuch, however, as six of the original feoffees were dead, he directed that if death should reduce the number to three, the survivors should enfeoff two from a list of twelve included in this instrument, who should then re-enfeoff the survivors of the original feoffees and add to them the rest of the twelve named. He gave instructions, further, that if he should die and if his executors should not have sufficient from other sources to meet all expenses, the feoffees should make up the amount and then surrender what remained to Henry's son if he had one. Otherwise they were to divide the estate geographically on Henry's death, giving the northern half to the duke of Bedford and the southern to the duke of Gloucester. If either should die without male issue, his portion should thereafter be annexed to the crown. It is remarkable that in this, as in his former will, Henry makes no mention of his eldest brother, the duke of Clarence (Wills of Kings, 236 sq.; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 118).

on the 25th he appointed the duke of Bedford to act as his lieutenant during his absence, with a salary of 8000 marks a year¹; and on the next day he transacted business on board his ship at Portsmouth².

The causes of the king's dilatoriness are not evident. Many ships and soldiers were unpunctual³, but it is clear that a vast force of both had been assembled at Southampton for months, at great cost to the nation, and at some loss to the strength of the expedition, for as early as June 5 measures had to be taken to check desertion⁴. The musters were held in various places in Hampshire—Chilworth⁵, Knoldenhall⁶, Wallopforth⁷, Tichbourne Down⁸, Beaulieu Heath⁹, Portsdown¹⁰, and others—and the countryside must have suffered in many ways from the presence of such large numbers of soldiers under imperfect discipline and with nothing definite to do.

Notwithstanding the disadvantages of delay, it was perhaps well for those concerned in the expedition that it was held back until, owing to a notable English success, it could put to sea in security. At daybreak on June 29¹¹, the earl of Huntingdon, who was cruising in the Channel to protect vessels making their way to Southampton, fell in with a fleet of twenty-six ships under the command of Percival, a bastard son of Louis II, duke of Bourbon¹². The French commander had with him nine large Genoese carracks¹³, and 1500 or 1600 Biscayans and other Spaniards, with 700 or 800 picked Genoese crossbowmen and lances, and his squadron had for the last three months been watching the mouth of the Seine¹⁴. As the fleets neared, the English suffered grievously from the unerring bolts of the

¹ Rym. ix. 475.

² Chanc. Warr. 1364/30, 31.

³ e.g. troops from Hants., Wilts., Dorset, and Sussex, ordered to muster at Southampton on June 3, were none of them present on that date, and the proclamation was repeated for June 10 (Claus. 5 Hen. V, 15 d).

⁴ Claus. 5 Hen. V, 14.

⁵ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 24,704, f. 1.

⁶ Gesta, App. 266.

⁷ Ibid. 267. Perhaps near Over Wallop or Nether Wallop, not far from Stockbridge.

⁸ Ibid. 269.

⁹ Ibid. 268.

¹⁰ Ibid. 271.

¹¹ Chron. Lond. 105; Kingsford, Chron. 71, Lit. 288, 331 (Latin Brut); Morosini, ii. 137.

¹² He was knighted on Sept. 6, 1415 (Anselme, i. 303). The French commander has usually been identified with Alexander, son of Duke John, then a prisoner in England (ibid. i. 304; Roncière, ii. 226; Vallet de Viriville, i. 55). Contemporaries call him simply the "bastard of Bourbon" (cf. Norm. Chron., Hellot, 27; Otterbourne, 278; Kingsford, Chron. 71).

¹³ Ibid. 71.

¹⁴ Morosini, ii. 36; Tit. Liv. 31; Vita, 93.

Genoese, but fortune turned when they grappled at close quarters. Both sides fought fiercely and lost heavily, some 150 men being drowned or killed. After a three hours' fight, the English captured four of the carracks, together with the Bastard and a large sum of money which he had with him to pay three months' wages to the crews. The rest of the French ships escaped¹. The four prizes were renamed and added to the king's ships², three being of the enormous portage of 1200 tons and one of 800³.

¹ St Denys, vi. 96; Juv. 536; Norm. Chron. (Williams), 176; Kingsford, Chron. 71; Tit. Liv. 31; Vita, 93.

² Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 142; Woodward, ii. 253; Morosini, ii. 138; Roncière, ii. 227.

³ "His in locis ante id tempus non visae," Tit. Liv. 30. There is no good account of the fight, which was overshadowed by the events which immediately followed and in some sources confused with the naval battle of the previous year.

CHAPTER LI

HENRY'S SECOND EXPEDITION: NORMANDY INVADED

THANKS to the exploit of the earl of Huntingdon, the great armament, when on July 30¹ it at last put to sea, was able to make the passage in full confidence and security. Of all the foreign expeditions of English kings in the Middle Ages, this is perhaps the most interesting to the modern student, for more is known of the personnel, equipment, and organisation of this than of any other. Not only, as we have seen, do we possess an exceptional amount of information about the composition of the great fleet, numbering some 1500 craft, great and small, which had assembled at or near Southampton², but there still exists, in an excellent state of preservation, a bulky roll containing the names of over 7000 of the combatants who passed muster at Southampton, a document of such value that one wonders why its contents have not long been published in full. For many years it was assumed that the roll contained the names of men who had fought in 1415, and many writers who had never seen the original were content to refer to it as the Roll of Agincourt³. An examination of its contents, however, proves beyond doubt that it belongs to the year 1417, to which it is correctly attributed by two modern writers⁴ who have described and analysed it. Each of them has counted the names in the roll, with the result that one gives the total as 7767 and the other as 7894⁵. It is greatly to be hoped that the roll will soon be printed⁶.

¹ Chron. Lond. 106; Kingsford, Chron. 71; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 150. Livius and most modern writers give a wrong date.

² Gesta, 110; Tit. Liv. 31; Vita, 92 sq.

³ It was unfortunately described as such for some time in the catalogue of the Public Record Office. [It is now catalogued as Exch. Accts. 51/2.]

⁴ B. Williams, Gesta, App. 265 sqq.; Ramsay, i. 251.

⁵ Williams gives 1792 lances, 5911 archers, and 64 unspecified (Gesta, 273); Ramsay gives 1821 lances and 6073 archers (loc. cit.). [The most recent examination of the roll has been made by Professor R. A. Newhall. The results appear in his book, *The English Conquest of Normandy, 1416-1424*. The typewritten thesis on which this work is based (Harvard University Library, HU 90. 1215) contains in App. VII a summary of the contents of the roll. Here the numbers of each retinue are given, the total amounting to 1770 men-at-arms and 6069 archers.]

⁶ In Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 24,704 there is a partial transcript of the roll, which contains the names verbatim down to John Nevil, kt., but stops after giving the first twenty-eight of his lances.

It has sometimes been supposed that we have in the roll an enumeration of the whole of Henry's force, and it has even been asserted that neither in 1415 nor in 1417 was England able to ship to France an army of more than 8000 fighting men¹. This statement, however, is refuted by the contents of the roll itself, which in its present form is certainly not complete. It has been suggested² that it contains only the musters from the south and west, those from the rest of England having been lost. However that may be, the roll omits the retinues of the king, the duke of Clarence³, Gilbert Lord Talbot⁴, the earl of Oxford⁵, and Edmund Lord Ferrers of Chartley⁶, and we know too of several knights and squires who were with the expedition but whose names the roll fails to mention⁷. Livius, copied by the author of the *Vita*, puts the number of fighting men at 16,400, and adds particulars of the larger retinues which yield a total of 9118⁸, but his details are frequently in disagreement with those on the roll. A letter written in London on May 7, 1417, estimates that there would be more than 25,000 men-at-arms⁹—an absurd computation. Contemporary French writers naturally exaggerate the size of the army: Cagny magnifies the figures to 3000 or 4000 men-at-arms and 25,000 or 30,000 archers¹⁰, Juvéna1 des Ursins gives the total as 50,000¹¹, while the chronicler of St Denis names that figure as the number of the archers alone¹². On the whole, however, we are not likely to go far wrong if we accept the English estimate of 16,400; it is certainly better supported than the lower figures that have recently found favour¹³.

¹ Ramsay, in E.H.R. xviii. 624. It may be mentioned that Wolsey, in a letter of Aug. 30, 1523, referred to the duke of Suffolk's army of 12,300 men as the largest that had left England for the last hundred years (Letters and Papers of Henry VIII, iii. pp. cclxxv, 1360).

² Gesta, 109 n. [The suggestion is manifestly absurd, as the roll records the musters of the earl of Northumberland, Lord Clifford, Lord Grey of Codnor, Gilbert Umfraville, and other notable men of the north and midlands.]

³ Cf. Tit. Liv. 31.

⁴ Rym. ix. 486; cf. Carte, Rolls, i. 150.

⁵ Fr. Roll 4 Hen. V, 20.

⁶ Tit. Liv. 32.

⁷ Cf. Rym. ix. 595; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 232; Feudal Aids, i. 59; Wals. ii. 324. It should be noticed that a few days after the landing in Normandy the king spoke of his force as the men "ordained to go with us for the first passage," which suggests that a good many were left behind (Riley, Mem. 654). [It need not be supposed, however, that all the men named in the roll sailed in July.]

⁸ Livius, 31 sqq.; Vita, 92.

⁹ Alart, Invent. Somm. i. 126.

¹⁰ Cagny, 109.

¹¹ Juv. 534.

¹² St Denys, vi. 100.

¹³ I leave Dr Wylie's opinion on record. But, having studied Professor Newhall's detailed analysis of the composition of Henry's army (Harvard University Library,

The fighting men were accompanied by 1000 smiths and carpenters¹, and by skilled miners and pioneers² from Dinant³ and Liège⁴, besides the hordes of servants that were never expected to do any combatant service. The force was well found in all necessities for conducting sieges, and con-

HU 90. 1215, App. VII, I am convinced of the substantial correctness of his contention that when it sailed to France in 1417, "its total fighting strength was some 10,000 men" (English Conquest, 192). In his published book his argument is meagre and confused, and fails to do justice to his case. This rests on an investigation of the career of every captain who is known to have served in Henry's army from 1417 onward. He has compiled a list that must be very nearly, if not quite, exhaustive, and it has consequently become clear that we have on record the size of almost all the contingents that crossed the Channel in 1417.

The muster-roll described by Dr Wylie (Exch. Accts. 51/2) yields a total of 7839. The particulars of three big retinues—those of Clarence, Ferrers of Chartley, and Gilbert Talbot—were omitted from the roll but are supplied by Livius; they add 1440 men. From Add. MS. 4601 and Stowe MS. 440, both in the British Museum, Professor Newhall has extracted details of a few retinues, which increase the total by 301. Altogether we have 9580 men.

There were in addition the men attached to the king's household. Their numbers seem not to be recorded; in the army of 1415 there were 152. We have, too, the names of eight captains who had retinues of unknown strength (D.K.R. xliv. 587-596, 598, 599). Besides these, fifteen men who were afterwards captains in France may have commanded contingents in the summer of 1417, though there is no evidence that they did (ibid. xli. 711, 713, xliv. 587-596, 598, 599). But apart from these doubtful cases, there can hardly have been a single captain in the force whose existence is not on record. To the total of 9580 there must thus be added the men of the king's household, and at least eight, and perhaps twenty-three, retinues, but no more. Now the twenty-three men in question were for the most part of no great consequence. Even if, as is most improbable, they were all captains in July, 1417, they would scarcely have mustered 1000 men between them. I feel sure, at any rate, that the total number of combatants in the expedition cannot have reached 11,000.

How then, it may be asked, did Livius get his figure of 16,400? The text of the passage where it occurs is corrupt, and his arithmetic is manifestly weak. But, not to dwell upon evasions of the difficulty, it is likely that he was led astray by his belief that "lance" in an English indenture meant three mounted men (p. 31, "cum lanceis sive militum triadibus ducentis et quadraginta"). This mistake would naturally cause him to treble the actual number of men-at-arms. Livius gives particulars of a number of retinues which yield a total of 2281 men-at-arms and 6830 archers. It is true that adding 4562 men-at-arms would make a total of less than 13,700; but he may also have been taking into account the king's household, the numbers of which he does not mention, the 840 archers from Lancashire and Cheshire who appear in the muster-roll but are not among the contingents noticed by him, and the smiths, sappers, and other members of the large labour corps, about which he seems to have known a good deal. In any case the figure 16,400 rests on his unsupported authority, which, I think, must bow to the conclusions drawn from the researches of Professor Newhall.]

¹ Tit. Liv. 33; Vita, 92; Nicolas, Navy, ii. 428. For £1000 paid for wages of masons, carpenters, and divers other artisans, see Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Pasch., April 29, 1417, and £138. 15s. 6d. paid to William Strete, master-carpenter, and fifty-nine carpenters, ibid. May 8, 1417.

² Goodwin, 158.

³ Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Mich., Oct. 4, 1417. Nicholas Swyr and twenty foreign miners left London for Southampton on July 21, 1417 (For. Accts. 51, C).

⁴ Devon, 352; Gesta, 114.

temporaries seem to have been impressed by the amount of food transported¹.

The start was made to the sound of trumpet and clarion, with a favouring wind, the lead being taken by two of the royal ships, known as the *King's Chamber* and the *King's Hall*². It must have been a brilliant spectacle, for after the fashion of the time the ships were resplendent with heraldic devices, painted on their sails and capstans, or set up on their castles and mast-heads³. The earl of Huntingdon was appointed "to govern the fleet," that is, presumably, to direct its movements, the appointment, it is carefully stated, being made without prejudice to the rights of the duke of Exeter as admiral⁴. To the last the destination of the fleet was kept a secret even from the king's most intimate friends⁵. While the French expected it to make for Harfleur⁶, where a safe landing was now assured, some preparations for defence had been made at Ardres, Boulogne, Dieppe, Le Crotoy, and St Valéry⁷: but after two smooth days at sea the English sailed into the haven at the mouth of the little river Touques⁸, on the south side of the estuary of the Seine, where the pleasure-seekers of Trouville now do their marketing. Five hundred horsemen had assembled on the shore, and made a rush to oppose the first landing-party, but on their leader being killed by the English archers, all resistance was abandoned in despair. So the whole force disembarked on the same day (Aug. 1). After giving thanks to God for this hopeful beginning, the king knighted forty-eight of his principal followers, and formally appointed the duke of Clarence constable of the host⁹. Tents were pitched anywhere in the marshes that lay to the west of the river¹⁰, and the king and the leading captains took up their quarters in some houses near the shore¹¹.

¹ Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Pasch., passim; Brut, ii. 382, "gonnez, tripgettis, Engynez, sowez, Bastillez, bryggez of lethir, scaling ladders, mallis, spadez, shouyllez"; Kingsford, Lit. 303.

² Tit. Liv. 33.

³ Gesta, 111 n.; Nicolas, Navy, ii. 446.

⁴ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 112.

⁵ Vita, 96; Tit. Liv. 33.

⁶ Basin, iv. 11.

⁷ Trahisons de France, 130.

⁸ Gesta, 111; Kingsford, Chron. 126, Lit. 331; Brut, 382; Basin, iv. 111; Blondel, i. 445; Tit. Liv. 33.

⁹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 316; Rym. ix. 551, 594; Gesta, 112; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 150; Tit. Liv. 33; Wals. ii. 321; Chron. Lond. 106; Kingsford, Chron. 71, 126, Lit. 303, First Life, 81; Brut, ii. 382; Chron. Ric. II-Hen. VI, 45; Waurin, ii. 241; Cordeliers, 254; Cousinot, 162; Cochoin, 278; Bec Chron. 82, 225; Basin, i. 26; Blondel, i. 263; J. Meyer, 250; Marest, 143; Goodwin, 155; Anstis, i. 323.

¹⁰ Waurin, ii. 241; Cordeliers, 240.

¹¹ Tit. Liv. 33.

After a day or two the king moved into the town of Touques¹, beyond which, at a distance of about a mile, stood the great castle of Bonneville², one of the strongest posts in Normandy³. Already the earl of Huntingdon had been sent forward with a detachment of troops to summon the garrison to surrender. Their hearts failed them at the first threat of siege, and on Aug. 3 the commander agreed to submit if the place were not relieved within six days⁴. He sent word to the dauphin at Rouen that he could not hold out without help, but the messenger was hanged for bringing such craven tidings⁵. The garrison consequently surrendered on Aug. 9⁶, and were suffered to depart, leaving their victuals and artillery⁷. The French government marked its sense of the disgrace by beheading Jean Bonenfant, an esquire who had helped to arrange the capitulation without striking a blow⁸. King Henry at once communicated his success to the mayor of London in a letter which was received with transports of joy⁹. The capture of Bonneville laid open all the rich *vicomté* of Auge¹⁰. The garrison of Auvillars had already offered terms, and they surrendered to the earl of Salisbury on Aug. 14¹¹.

Welcome plunder was soon brought in by foraging parties, before whom the peasants at first fled in panic to the towns¹². In the next generation it was represented that the English were a ragged rabble and regarded as wild beasts rather than men¹³. But this view, if ever entertained by the Normandy peasants, was soon given up. Henry was not there as a raider but as the

¹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 145 sq., 149.

² Then known as the castle of Touques and so called in the principal English sources. It has been supposed that there was a separate castle at Touques, but there is no doubt that Bonneville is the castle referred to (see Delarue, ii. 534, Nouveaux Essais, ii. 264).

³ Bouvier, 433; Gesta, 112; Tit. Liv. 34; Vita, 99; Serres, i. 993.

⁴ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 145, 284; Rym. ix. 479, where the English signatories are John Cornwall and William Porter. The names of the garrison, 106 in number, are given in Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 147.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 34; Vita, 99.

⁶ Gesta, 112; Tit. Liv. 34; Vita, 99.

⁷ Wals. ii. 321.

⁸ Juv. 533; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 284.

⁹ Riley, Mem. 654; Delpit, 219.

¹⁰ Auge was granted to the duke of Clarence before Sept. 26, 1417 (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 157; Rym. ix. 496).

¹¹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 146, 157, 285; Rym. ix. 480 sq., 495; Wals. ii. 321; Tit. Liv. 34; Vita, 99. Robert Hornby was appointed captain (Gesta, 276).

¹² Blondel, i. 263.

¹³ Basin, i. 27, 33; Cochon, 277.

lawful king of the land¹. First he announced that any man who robbed a monk or a priest should be hanged², whereupon many country people donned priests' garments, tonsured their crowns, and circulated unmolested in the English camp. Soon, however, the need for this subterfuge was removed by a further proclamation against outrages on women and the plundering of people who voluntarily submitted³.

When Henry left Touques on Aug. 13, he marched along the coast towards Caen⁴. He left behind, however, at Bonneville a garrison under John Keighley, a Yorkshire knight⁵; and it is probably to Keighley and his men⁶ that the English owed the capture of Lisieux during September⁷. The resistance offered must have been but slight; in fact, in the next generation there was a tradition that when the English entered, they found the city deserted save for one old man and one young woman⁸. This story has been readily accepted by modern French writers, but its absurdity is manifest when we remember that Lisieux was a cathedral city containing a large number of churchmen, a class whose interests were notoriously well cared for by the invader, that the townsmen had already declared for the duke of Burgundy⁹, that it was not, as modern writers have asserted¹⁰, an open town, and that a contemporary French chronicler expressly states that the citizens were overcome¹¹.

¹ See Rym. ix. 551 for pardon to two squires in the English army who had been condemned to death for plundering people under the king's protection.

² Vita, 97.

³ Wals. ii. 322.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Gesta, 275; Brut, ii. 383; Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 339; Whitaker, Craven, 205.

⁶ Keighley became captain of Lisieux (Gesta, 276).

⁷ In Gesta (115), Tit. Liv. (42), Vita (116), the capture of Lisieux is placed towards the end of Sept. 1417. In St Denys, vi. 162, it is said to have occurred immediately after the fall of Caen. The date has generally been given as May 17, 1418 (cf. Lefèvre-Pontalis, liv. 496, quoting Norm. Chron., ed. Hellot, 34), but this is certainly too late, for on Jan. 11, 1418, a muster of English troops was ordered to be held at Lisieux (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 359), on Jan. 12 the king granted a prebend in the cathedral (ibid. 232), and an English captain was appointed there before Feb. 9 (ibid. 365).

⁸ Basin, i. 27; J. Meyer, 250; Delarue, Nouv. Ess. ii. 263. Basin was bishop of Lisieux from 1447 to 1474.

[Newhall (57 and n. 114), citing Cousinot, 150, and Basin, i. 27, attributes the capture of Lisieux to Clarence and dates it Aug. 4. His authorities, however, are not very weighty in this context, and we may be sure that the fall of Bonneville would have been less advertised if it had been preceded by the capture of so important a place as Lisieux.]

⁹ Delarue, Nouv. Ess. ii. 262.

¹⁰ So Puiseux, 23; Sarrazin, Cauchon, 173. The town was certainly walled when the French recaptured it in 1449 (Blondel, Reductio, 70).

¹¹ Ibid. 71.

The obscurity in which the capture of Lisieux is shrouded is doubtless due in part to the fact that when the place fell all eyes were turned on Caen. Since its capture by Edward III some seventy years before, when it was almost unfortified¹, Caen had been surrounded by a wall six or seven feet thick, pierced with twelve gates, bastioned with thirty-two towers², and covered on three sides by deep water-ditches³. On the south the town was protected by the river Odon, which flows through the meadows in many channels, forming islands at its junction with the Orne. One of these, the Île St Jean, was independently fortified, so that the Odon flowed between two towns, each able to stand a siege of its own⁴. Within the circuit of the town walls, on the rising ground to the north-east, stood the great castle, begun by William the Conqueror and enlarged by his son Henry, with its huge square keep and its moat hewn out of solid rock, rightly accounted one of the finest and strongest fortresses in Normandy⁵, while to the English it seemed another town as large as Caen itself⁶. And that was saying much, for an earlier chronicler had reckoned that except for London England had no town exceeding Caen in size⁷. A modern writer estimates the population of those days as at least 40,000⁸. The town's chief industry was the manufacture of cloth, in particular woollen serge⁹. There was good pasturage for sheep close at hand, and woad for dyeing grew abundantly in the meadows near the town¹⁰. Twenty-five trades besides the weavers were represented in the Whitsuntide processions¹¹, and among them a special importance was claimed by the porters¹² who carried goods to and from the vessels that came up the Orne to the harbour just outside the walls.

The wealth of Caen is further indicated by the extraordinary number of its ecclesiastical foundations. With thirteen or fourteen parish churches and nearly thirty religious houses, it

¹ Lechaudé d'Anisy, 408, 410; Soc. Ant. Norm. xi. 206.

² Vaultier, 196-205; Huët, 64, 80; E. Beaufort, 505.

³ Tit. Liv. 36, 40; Vita, 103, 113.

⁴ Tit. Liv. 36; Vita, 103; Vaultier, 198.

⁵ Froiss. i. 223; Blondel, Reductio, 219; Bouvier, Recouvrement, 352.

⁶ Brut, ii. 384.

⁷ Avesbury, 359.

⁸ Puiseux, 13, 72.

⁹ Ibid. 73; Froiss. i. 223.

¹⁰ Puiseux, 15, 71. The town was specially noted for its pockets, called "tasques" (ibid. 15; Trébutien, 317; Delarue, ii. 328, 450; Vaultier, 273).

¹¹ Bras, 41.

¹² Puiseux, 72; Formeville, 295.

is no wonder that it was known as the city of churches¹. Besides the establishments within the town itself, there stood outside the walls the two world-famous abbeys of St Stephen and the Trinity, in one of which lay the body of William the Conqueror, in the other that of his wife Matilda. The latter, commonly called the *Abbaye des Dames*², from the high social standing of the nuns, stood on the high ground of St Gilles near the castle, was fortified with a strong wall³, and was known as Trinity Fort⁴. The abbey of St Stephen was just outside the wall on the western side of the town, and like its sister was strongly fortified⁵. Close to the castle, furthermore, stood the collegiate church of St Sepulchre, built in the twelfth century, which was also separately enclosed to form a third detached stronghold⁶.

When King Henry left Touques, on Aug. 13, he sent forward the duke of Clarence with 1000 picked men. Pressing on by the shortest route, this force reached Caen next day just in time to save the suburbs, which the French had already begun to fire, after the usual practice, in order to deprive the besiegers of cover near the walls⁷. Clarence found the Trinity abbey abandoned and at once occupied it as his headquarters. The garrison of the town and castle was too scanty to attempt to hold the outlying defences, and an order had been given that both abbeys should be demolished. The sudden arrival of the English saved the one, but all preparations were in hand for firing the other, the pillars of the nave of the church being already undermined. But one of the monks, who loved his church rather than his country, crept out of St Stephen's in the darkness of the night, crawled on all fours to the abbey of the Trinity, and sought out the duke of Clarence, whom he found lying asleep in his armour in a garden, with his head resting on a stone. Falling on his knees he implored the duke's intervention to save the great abbey that his forefathers had built, offering to guide him to a spot where the wall was weakly guarded. Clarence straightway got together a scaling party, and with the help of the monk

¹ Puisieux, 17.

² "Abbaye de Dames," Bouvier, *Recouvrement*, 348; "l'abbaye des Dames," Gruel, 212.

³ Erected between 1354 and 1359, Vaultier, 8, 54, 64; cf. St Denys, vi. 104.

⁴ Delarue, ii. 25; Puisieux, 77; Soc. Antiq. de Norm. xi. 192; Vita, 102.

⁵ Apparently at the same time as the other, Vaultier, loc. cit.

⁶ Soc. Antiq. de Norm. xi. 192; Puisieux, 77.

⁷ Tit. Liv. 35; Vita, 102; Chron. Lond. 106; Gregory, 115.

effected an easy entrance to the abbey. The few occupants were captured, but all were allowed to go free, except one whom the duke hanged for sacrilege because he was caught removing the bars from the windows of the church¹.

Meanwhile the king, with the main army, was approaching. On the day of his departure from Touques, he sent to the king of France a letter in which he called God to witness that he had striven for peace ever since he came to the throne, while his cousin had fed him with leaves but no fruit; and he now called upon him for the last time to give up the crown and kingdom of France, or worse evil would certainly come upon him². Then he advanced to Dives³, where he spent the night; the following day he reached Grentheville, where he stayed over the next day, which was Sunday and the feast of the Assumption⁴; on the Monday he moved on to Fontenay-le-Tesson⁵, lodging at the abbey; on Aug. 17, after crossing the Orne at Allemagne⁶, he halted at Èterville; and on the 18th his force encamped before the walls of Caen⁷.

Henry took up his quarters within the precincts of St Stephen's⁸. He mounted guns on the roofs and towers of the abbey buildings, whence he could see everything that went on in the town⁹. The biggest of his guns he disposed between the abbey and the western wall, under the direction of the duke of Gloucester¹⁰. Much artillery was also stationed in the fortress of the Trinity¹¹. The whole force was divided into four sections. The earls of Huntingdon, Salisbury, and Warwick, Lord Grey of Codnor, and Sir John Cornwall occupied the meadows on the right. On the left the Earl Marshal and Lord Matravers lay in the faubourg close to St Nicholas' church. The northern side was held by Gilbert Lord Talbot, Gilbert Umfraville, John Neville, and Robert Lord Willoughby, while to the east the duke of Clarence fronted the castle from his vantage-ground in the fortress of the Trinity¹². Thus the town was beset from the south-west to the north-east, the section to the south and south-

¹ Wals. ii. 322 sq.; Tit. Liv. 35 sq.; Vita, 102.

² Rym. ix. 482 sq.

³ Villa Sancte Salvatoris de Tyfe (Wals. ii. 322; Delarue, *Nouv. Ess.* ii. 262).

⁴ *Ibid.*; Wals. loc. cit.

⁵ [The place is now called St André de Fontenay.]

⁶ Delarue, ii. 334.

⁷ Wals. loc. cit.

⁸ *Ibid.* 323; Vita, 103; Gesta, 113.

⁹ Wals. ii. 322.

¹⁰ Vita, 104; Tit. Liv. 36.

¹¹ St Denys, vi. 104.

¹² Wals. ii. 322.

east being unapproachable owing to the various channels of the Orne, though passage of the river could be maintained by a bridge of hides, which had been sent from Harfleur¹.

The defence was conducted by William de Montenay², who had under him a force of the famous Genoese crossbowmen. The walls were protected by mounds of earth hastily thrown up; engines were mounted at points of vantage; and on every side a gallant resistance was offered. But the big guns of the English, some of which were brought up the Orne by ship, proved terribly effective, doing great destruction among the buildings of the town, though Henry refrained from battering a weak spot in the wall lest the church of St Stephen, which stood just within, should be damaged³. After about a fortnight of bombardment, mining, and other activities, an assault was planned for Sept. 4, the commander of the defence having refused Henry's demand for surrender. On the appointed day the king was up early, and found time to hear three Masses before the signal for attack was given by bugle from the royal tent. Answering calls rang out from the several camps, and the first scaling parties sprang forward to plant their ladders beyond the moat, into which quantities of faggots had been cast. The defenders on their part had manned the walls to the call of horns and trumpets, and as the assailants mounted struck them down, hurled stones on them, blew quicklime into their eyes, or poured upon them boiling water mixed with oil and fat. But the English, attacking in three waves, could not be stayed, though many of the ladders proved too short and dropped uselessly into the moat⁴. One of the newly-made knights, Edmund Springhouse by name, was in the forefront of a scaling party, but he missed his footing and fell into a breach of the wall, where the defenders flung their fire on him and

¹ For. Accts. 57, C. It had been made at Plymouth by John Janyn, one of the king's master-carpenters, who had under him sixteen or eighteen carpenters, smiths, and cobblers, their first instalment of wages being paid at Plymouth on Aug. 19, 1415. Janyn had 1s. a day and the rest 9d. The amount paid was £14. 13s. 4d. The bridge was shipped in sections to Harfleur, where it was stored for a year. It was used again in the sieges of Louviers, Pont de l'Arche, and Rouen.

² Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 153; Rym. ix. 490; Delarue, ii. 285.

³ Tit. Liv. 37; Vita, 105; St Denys, vi. 104; Delarue, Nouv. Ess. ii. 268; Bras, 38; Huët, 252; Puiseux, 45. The roof of St Stephen's was nevertheless badly damaged. For grant in aid of the chaplains of the church, whose revenues were immensely reduced by the war, see Rym. ix. 548; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 282.

⁴ Tit. Liv. 38 sq.; Vita, 108 sqq.; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 153; Wals. ii. 323; Capgr., De Illustr. 121; Cochon, 278; Blondel, i. 264, 446; Riley, Mem. 657; Puiseux, 49.

burned him alive. The king, it is said, was heavy and sorry on hearing of his death, but the sight of his fate spurred the courage of his comrades, and at the point where he fell the attack was pressed with redoubled vigour¹. It was the duke of Clarence who first broke through the defence, the king having withdrawn some of the troops on his side in order to meet a relief force which was reported to be approaching but did not appear². Clarence gained a footing on the Île St Jean at the end of the Rue Neuve³; a certain Harry Ingles is remembered as the first Englishman to get in⁴. Fighting in the streets followed, the English slaying all the men they met, priests excepted, and after a hard struggle they reached the bridge near the Black Friars. This they rushed, headed by the earl of Warwick, who, on reaching the great tower called the "little castle" mounted a ladder shouting "A Clarence, a Clarence, a St George!" and was the first on the battlements, where he planted the royal banner. There ensued a terrible conflict in the streets and houses, but Clarence's men forced their way through the town and drove the French from the battlements on the far side⁵. More than 1800 Frenchmen⁶ were slaughtered in the streets; but, while many English perished during the siege⁷, we know from a letter of the king's that the whole dreadful business of the assault was effected "with right little death of our people⁸." When resistance had ceased and the streets were piled with dead and dying, the victors turned to the inevitable sack and plunder, and King Henry, who had returned and entered through a gate thrown open by Clarence's troops, rode to St Peter's church to give thanks⁹.

¹ Wals. ii. 324; Brut, ii. 384; Peter Chron. 488; Kingsford, Lit. 124.

² Tit. Liv. 38.

³ "Par malvese garde," Cochon, 278; Delarue, *Nouv. Ess.* ii. 270; Rev. Anglo-Fr. v. 270. The street is now the Rue Neuve St Jean (Mancel, 16; Puiseux, 52).

⁴ Worcester, *Itin.* 373.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 38 sq.; Vita, 111; Wals. ii. 324; Gesta, 113 n.; Brut, ii. 384; Chron. Ric. II-Hen. VI, 45; Norm. Chron. 179; Blondel, i. 264; Vaultier, 9; Delarue, i. 126, *Nouv. Ess.* ii. 270; Bras, 59.

⁶ From document dated 1464 in *Martyrologe* or Charter Book of Caen in Lechaudé d'Anisy, *Chartes*, ii. 410. Cf. Delarue, *Nouv. Ess.* ii. 272; Puiseux, 52; Vaultier, 9. "Maxima in copia trucidati sunt," Blondel, i. 264. Basin, i. 27, gives the same impression. On the other hand, Monstrelet (iii. 242) gives 600 as the figure, and Le Fèvre (i. 320) puts it at no more than 500.

⁷ Tit. Liv. 37; Monstr. iii. 242; Morosini, ii. 146.

⁸ Riley, *Mem.* 657; Delpit, 220. Sir James Harington was among those killed (Kingsford, Lit. 289; cf. vol. i. 478).

⁹ Tit. Liv. 40. [The author of the "First English Life" says (p. 92) that when order was restored Henry had all the valuables yet un plundered brought together into "a

The butchery at Caen has sometimes been regarded by modern writers¹ as due to the calculated design of a ruthless conqueror to strike terror at the outset of his gigantic task and thus to lighten its succeeding stages; and this was certainly its effect. But to contemporaries it seemed nothing but a sad necessity. The garrison had deliberately refused to yield, and they were bound to take the usual consequences². Taking this for granted, the English chroniclers claim special praise for the king in that he issued orders that no woman should be outraged, no priest molested, and no church plundered³—injunctions which unquestionably had some effect, though with all his discipline Henry could not prevent his men from sometimes getting out of hand. Yet it would have been far better for his fame had he forbidden all massacre and pillage as soon as resistance had ceased; and if such heroic forbearance is too much to look for in those callous and bloody days⁴, common prudence might nevertheless have taught him leniency towards the people whom he aimed at making his subjects. It is humiliating to our pride in a national hero to read the language of those who suffered under his heavy hand, for when the broken spirit of the French began to revive, the foul massacre of Caen was ever foremost in their minds⁵.

The town being completely in his hands, King Henry turned to the reduction of the castle, where the defence was rendered well-nigh desperate by the addition of about a thousand useless mouths that had fled for refuge into the enclosure⁶. Indeed, within five days of the capture of the town, the castle came to terms, having undergone neither assault nor bombardment⁷. On Sept. 9, a document was signed in which the garrison agreed to capitulate if no relief should come before Sept. 19. Their lives were to be spared; every man might keep his horse, armour, and clothing; and a sum of money not exceeding 2000 crowns might be retained and shared by the men according to

greate and stronge house," and gave them to Clarence, reserving for himself only "a goodly French Booke." The duke distributed much of the property among his men. This is one of the stories for which the earl of Ormonde is named as the narrator's authority.]

¹ [As, for instance, by Newhall, op. cit. 59 sq.]

² Cf. St Denys, vi. 134.

⁴ [I leave Dr Wylie's words, written before 1914.]

⁵ See esp. Blondel, *Reductio*, 220 sq.

³ Tit. Liv. 39, 40; Vita, 111, 113.

⁶ Delarue, *Nouv. Ess.* ii. 273.

⁷ Rym. ix. 490; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 287 sqq.; Lechaudé d'Anisy, 217; Riley, Mem. 657; Delpit, 220; Cagny, 110.

their rank: but everything else was to be left behind. An armistice was granted in order that the garrison might appeal to Rouen for help; but their cry fell on deaf ears. On Sept. 20, therefore, a rich silken tent was pitched before the castle, and there the king sat in state while the governor, kneeling, delivered up the keys and the garrison passed out¹. A thousand of them were allowed to go without their arms to Falaise², where the English were to meet them again. The English said that the women in the castle, disregarding the terms of the capitulation, carried off a quantity of money in leathern bottles, while a fire, which the French were suspected of having started, destroyed all the stuff that had not been taken away³.

The king took up his quarters in the palace that William the Conqueror had erected in the castle bailey⁴, and there he resided till Oct. 1, arranging for the settlement of the town. In a letter, dated Sept. 11, the duke of Clarence had reported to the mayor of London the fall of many places besides Caen, and had stated his belief that in a short while the king's whole purpose would be achieved and that nothing was now wanted but people to settle in the captured towns and hold them⁵. Settlers were soon invited from England to Caen, and confiscated houses were allotted to them⁶. A contemporary writer, who was in Paris at the time, says that 25,000 persons were driven out in one day⁷. Diligent search, however, has revealed the names of only 102 who refused to accept Henry's authority, and these were drawn, not merely from Caen, but from a wide area around⁸. Modern French writers have estimated the number of the refugees at 3000⁹. Many no doubt did prefer flight to submission, but all the available evidence shows that the great majority of the townsfolk remained and accepted the new conditions. It is typical of the complete resignation of most of the inhabitants that one of the earliest official documents met with after the capture of the town records permission for the

¹ Rym. ix. 493; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 165; Tit. Liv. 41; Vita, 115; St Denys, vi. 106.

² Rym. ix. 393, 394; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 166.

³ Wals. ii. 325.

⁴ Rym. ix. 495 sqq.; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 154-171 passim; Gesta, 115.

⁵ Delpit, 220.

⁶ Vita, 113.

⁷ St Denys, vi. 108. This estimate has been accepted by many later writers, while some treat it as too low. It has even been supposed that 100,000 people fled from Normandy to Brittany (Masseville, iv. 62).

⁸ Puisieux, Emigration, 102.

⁹ So Delarue, ii. 334, and Vaultier, 273.

daughter of a Caen burgess to marry an Englishman¹. But if some resistance still found place among the laity, there is no room for doubt as to the attitude of the clergy. Among seculars and regulars alike, Henry's offer of protection found a ready welcome, and a list² is extant which shows that 123 ecclesiastical submissions were received as soon as Caen was in his possession. The list includes a number of abbeys, priories, and parish priests in the region already occupied by the English.

Meanwhile events of much interest had been occurring elsewhere. Before Henry left England, he had appointed the earl of March to take command of the transports as soon as they should have disembarked the troops at Touques and return with them to England to fetch part of the army for which he apparently had not been able to find room³. Accordingly all the ships save those that carried artillery were sent back from Touques at the first possible moment⁴. Some of them must speedily have returned to France, for at Caen on Sept. 1 Henry granted their discharge to 117 Dutch vessels and 122 English ones⁵. The earl of March, however, after cruising for a while in the Channel⁶, sailed early in September for La Hogue with the second instalment of the expeditionary force under the convoy of Thomas Carew and his squadron⁷. Landing at St Vaast, the earl marched through the Cotentin, plundering as he went. He attacked St Lô, but was beaten off, and passed on to join the king at Caen⁸.

While Henry was at Caen, detachments of his army gained some useful successes. In the middle of August the earl of Huntingdon, Gilbert Talbot, and Gilbert Umfraville were

¹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 184, Sept. 30, 1417. The chronicler of St Denis suggests that favourable treatment was offered to those who consented to marry Englishmen (vi. 164).

² Dated Sept. 7 (Rym. ix. 488 sqq.; Rot. Norm., Hardy, 331 sqq.).

³ Rym. ix. 466 sq. Yet twelve of the king's ships, including the Genoese prizes, were left in the Hamble, manned with skeleton crews (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 144).

⁴ Tit. Liv. 34.

⁵ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 320 sqq.

⁶ Brut, ii. 383, 385.

⁷ On Sept. 1, 1417, Thomas Carew received verbal orders from the king to convoy the earl of March and others to "Hogges" (Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 126; Exch. Accts. 48/12, 13). For £266. 13s. 8d. paid for ships for the transport of the earl of March and other lords, with their retinues, going "in presentiam regis," see Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Pasch., Sept. 20, 1417. [This force is taken into account above (p. 51, n. 13) in the discussion of the strength of Henry's army.]

⁸ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 181, 231, (Hellot) 33. The chronology of March's voyage and subsequent exploits is the subject of much confusion in the chronicles, some of which ascribe his return to France to the following spring. But the references in note 7 above seem incontrovertibly to place it in September.

empowered to attack enemy strongholds¹. By Aug. 22 Creully, with a number of dependencies, had passed into English hands², and on Aug. 25 Villers-Bocage came to terms with Huntingdon³—acquisitions which went far to secure Henry against any attempt to relieve Caen from the west. September witnessed the actual surrender of Lingèvres⁴ and Tilly-sur-Seulles⁵, and the signing of capitulations by Thury-Harcourt⁶ and Lamotte-de-Cesny⁷. Much more important, however, was the capture of Bayeux. The city had recently been fortified with high walls and deep moats, and a strong castle stood at its south-west corner⁸. Nevertheless, it offered no serious resistance to the duke of Gloucester, who was sent against it. By Sept. 8 terms of surrender had been signed, and on the 19th the town was occupied by the English without further trouble⁹. Next day, a Lancashire man, John Ashton, was appointed seneschal of Bayeux¹⁰; but the completeness of the submission was such that many subordinate offices, including that of *vicomte*, were forthwith entrusted to Frenchmen¹¹. All the cathedral revenues were taken into the king's hand, and he appointed a cathedral treasurer¹², but great numbers of clergy in the city and its neighbourhood had accepted English rule even before its occupation, and on making formal submission the dean and chapter soon received their own again¹³. On Oct. 20 Ashton was authorised to issue tickets bearing his seal to those who should apply for them within eight days; others were to be treated as enemies¹⁴.

¹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 150, 286.

² Ibid. 151.

³ Ibid. 152, 286.

⁴ Ibid. 163; Postel, 16, 17.

⁵ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 162 sq.; Lechaudé d'Anisy, 218, 221.

⁶ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 158, 172.

⁷ Ibid. 172; Delarue, *Nouv. Ess.* ii. 278; Caumont, *Journal*, 301, 302; Postel, 7.

⁸ Ibid. 23, 30; cf. *Norm. Chron.* (Hellot), 35; Béziers, *Mem.* 212–215. The garrison numbered at least 200 men-at-arms and 50 crossbowmen (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 153 sq.).

⁹ Ibid. 153, 164, 167; *Rym.* ix. 493; *Tit. Liv.* 40; *Vita*, 114, 116; *Wals.* ii. 325.

¹⁰ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 320; Delisle, *Baillis*, 40, 109; *Pezet*, 384; *Postel*, 47, 125. He was lord of the manor of Ashton-under-Lyne (*Baines, Lanc.* i. 424), and had been made a knight of the Bath in 1399 (*Kingsford, Chron.* 48).

¹¹ *Carel*, 264, 271, 276, 298, 302, 305, 316, 322; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 218; *Bréquigny*, 14.

¹² *Rym.* ix. 541; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 232.

¹³ *Rym.* ix. 530, 531, 575; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 219, 371; *Postel*, 76, 124.

¹⁴ *Rym.* ix. 504; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 187.

CHAPTER LII

CONQUEST IN LOWER NORMANDY

HAVING appointed Gilbert Umfraville captain of the town, Henry left Caen on Oct. 1¹. On Oct. 2 and 3 he was at St Pierre-sur-Dives², where he had news of the capitulation of the castle of Courcy³: on the next day he was at Trun⁴, and by Oct. 5 he was before the strong fortress of Argentan. The townfolk made no stand, but offered terms as soon as the English appeared⁵. All the inhabitants might have stayed and occupied their homes in peace; but 500 burgesses preferred to emigrate to Brittany, Anjou, or Maine⁶.

It needed no long experience to convince the Normans that they were being abandoned to their fate, and they had no wish for a carnage such as had just fallen on the people of Caen⁷. They knew that the duke of Burgundy, then the triumphant man in France, was really allied with the English⁸; they saw that there was a prospect of just treatment under the English king, and that taxation would be lighter⁹; and so, in spite of a considerable number of irreconcilables, the bulk of them decided to submit, and if they did not (as an English chronicler asserts)¹⁰ flock in with boisterous delight, they no doubt saw where their interest lay. The king entered Argentan on Oct. 9¹¹, and the next few days were spent in arranging the capitulation of the castles of Chailloué¹², Exmes¹³, Laigle¹⁴, Chambois¹⁵, O¹⁶, and others, together with the town of Essay¹⁷. At the populous city of Sées, with its noble

¹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 159; Tit. Liv. 43; Vita, 119.

² Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 172, 173.

³ Tit. Liv. 43; Vita, 119.

⁴ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 174.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 43; Vita, 119, 120; Cagny, 110; Juv. 534.

⁶ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 175; Lechaudé d'Anisy, 230; Puiseux, Emigr. 18.

⁷ St Denys, vi. 160; Blondel, i. 35, 129.

⁸ Juv. 535.

⁹ Tit. Liv. 43.

¹⁰ Gesta, 115.

¹¹ Puiseux, Emigr. 911.

¹² Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 176; Caumont, Journal, 301.

¹³ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 177.

¹⁴ Ibid. 306; Rym. ix. 501.

¹⁵ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 177, 191.

¹⁶ At Mortrée, near Alençon, Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 178.

¹⁷ Ibid. 180; Gesta, 116; Gall. Christ. xi. 742.

cathedral and other important ecclesiastical foundations—some of which had been negotiating before the English arrived—the fortified abbey of St Martin made a show of resistance, but this was not long maintained, and the abbot came in for the same favourable treatment as his fellows elsewhere¹. On Oct. 20 arrangements were in progress for the bishop to make his submission², and by the spring he had been restored to the enjoyment of his temporal possessions and spiritual jurisdiction³, though his ecclesiastical court was transferred to Falaise⁴. A notable exception to the general attitude was afforded by the Cistercian abbey of La Trappe, at Soligny, the abbot of which, though a safe-conduct was issued on Nov. 10 for him to come and confer⁵, took to flight and was treated as a rebel. One of the monks, however, was pliable enough to be considered safe, and to him the belongings of the abbey were entrusted on Feb. 1, 1418⁶. Meanwhile the laity were little if at all behind-hand, and lists of submissions received between Oct. 24 and 28⁷ seem to show that they came in faster than they could be dealt with.

From Argentan the army moved on to Alençon, where the king arrived on Oct. 15⁸, and dated documents indicate his presence in the camp or the castle there till the beginning of December⁹. The fortifications of both the town and the castle were of quite exceptional strength¹⁰, but although the place was well supplied with all requisites for sustaining a prolonged siege¹¹, yet even before Henry arrived on the ground still known as the King's Field¹², the now familiar colloquies had begun, and as a result the English were admitted on Oct. 22, not a blow having been struck¹³. Meanwhile the English were rapidly extending their hold on the region to the east of the main advance, and by the end of the month they were in possession of Verneuil and Mortagne¹⁴. The fall of Alençon, moreover, was followed by

¹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 179, 195, 334, 351, 352; Rym. ix. 501, 509, 551; Tit. Liv. 44; Vita, 120; Bréquigny, 206; D.K.R. xli. 686.

² Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 183, 196, 239; Rym. ix. 504; Gall. Christ. xi. 698.

³ Rym. ix. 578, 586; L. Hommey, iii. 256.

⁴ Galeron, Stat. i. 89.

⁵ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 196; Rym. ix. 509.

⁶ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 241; Bréquigny, 265.

⁷ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 347-350.

⁸ Tit. Liv. 44; Vita, 122.

⁹ For documents dated before or in Alençon, see Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 181-217; Gesta, 117 n.; For. Accts. 57 E; Hist. MSS. Rept. iv. 459.

¹⁰ Tit. Liv. 44; Vita, 122.

¹¹ Cagny, 112.

¹² Odolant-Desnos, i. 4; L. Hommey, iii. 255.

¹³ Cagny, 111 n., 112. ¹⁴ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 181, 183, 192, 193; Tit. Liv. 44.

a rapid push southward, which speedily gave them Beaumont-le-Vicomte, Dangeul, Nouans, and Bellême¹. Indeed the whole domain of the dukes of Alençon was reduced to subjection in less than fifteen days².

The young duke, John II, was only eight years of age. After his father's death at Agincourt, he had been removed from Argentan to join the party of the Armagnacs, with whom the late duke had been so closely identified. His mother Marie, who was still only twenty-six, was the eldest daughter of Queen Joan, the widow of Henry IV, and the sister therefore of the duke of Brittany. Whether this relationship had any connection with the events that followed is only matter for guessing; but it is certain that the duke of Brittany had already expressed a desire for a meeting with the invader, and no sooner had Alençon surrendered than a safe-conduct was issued guaranteeing him free access to King Henry at any time before Oct. 27³.

The duke of Brittany has received great praise for keeping his lands out of the range of the disastrous conflict that devastated all the rest of northern France and securing for his people a period of steady progress while his neighbours were a prey to destruction; but the trimming, whereby this restful time was gained, was far from high-souled or chivalrous, and while the duke was regarded with irritation by his relatives in England, he was no favourite with his neighbours in France⁴. Nine years before he had made a treaty with the late duke of Alençon, but the friendship of his ally turned afterwards to undisguised contempt⁵. His absence from the field of Agincourt was certainly only part of an understanding with the duke of Burgundy which developed later into a direct treaty of alliance, according to which they were to be brothers in arms, in honours, in prerogatives, and in profits⁶. By King Henry he was regarded with special dislike⁷, and the enmity between England and Brittany was naturally not abated when he issued letters of marque authorising Breton ships to prey upon English trade⁸. But circumstances had changed, and the

¹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 191, 194, 202; Tit. Liv. 45; Kingsford, Lit. 307; Brut, ii. 386.

² Cagny, loc. cit.

³ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 183; Rym. ix. 503.

⁴ For a favourable contemporary opinion of him, see St Denys, vi. 52; for an unfavourable one, see Blondel, *Reductio*, 17.

⁵ Odolant-Desnos, i. 461.

⁶ i.e. on Feb. 18, 1417, Blanchard, *Introd.* p. cxxiii, no. 1235; cf. *ibid.* no. 1316 and *itin.* 431, 432.

⁷ Jurade, 329.

⁸ Blanchard, ii. 205.

sinister alliance with the duke of Burgundy had led him to seek an interview with Henry in the previous spring. A safe-conduct, dated April 13, 1417, had authorised him to cross to England with a large following of bishops, counts, barons and knights¹; many English lords had been summoned to Reading to arrange a ceremonial reception for him²; and four English ships had been sent to bring him from St Malo to Southampton³. The visit is referred to by no contemporary annalist, English or Breton, and there is no trace of it in the published⁴ itinerary of the duke. One might conclude therefore that it never actually took place were it not that entries in the Issue Rolls record payments of expenses for the duke's voyage to England⁵. It is, however, improbable that he got further than Southampton, and what passed between him and Henry is wholly unknown.

Whatever his previous relations with the king may have been, he was evidently in a suspicious temper when negotiations, as we have seen, were resumed, for he refused to avail himself of his safe-conduct until a supplementary document had been issued⁶ containing a specific command to Henry's "allies" that no harm was to be done to the duke's lands while he was away. Before October was out, however, he arrived at Alençon with a large retinue⁷. Valuable presents were exchanged⁸, but all accounts agree that Henry was in no hurry to get to business. When at length an interview was arranged and the duke knelt on entering the king's presence, it was noticed that it was some time before Henry motioned him to rise⁹. Nevertheless, a truce was signed in the castle of Alençon on Nov. 16, 1417, to last till Michaelmas, 1418¹⁰. It was expressly stated to have been brought about by the influence of Queen Joan. Henry agreed not to molest the duke or his lands or to suffer anyone else to do so, while the duke on his part would see that his subjects abstained from all acts of war against the English, an undertaking which Frenchmen rightly interpreted as disloyalty to

¹ Rym. ix. 446; Morice, i. 462.

² For payments to messengers to them, see Iss. Roll 4 Hen. V, Mich., March 18, 1417.

³ Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Pasch., May 25, 1417; *ibid.* 6 Hen. V, Pasch., Sept. 27, 1418.

⁴ By Blanchard, *Introd.* pp. cxix sqq.

⁵ In Iss. Roll 6 Hen. V, Pasch., Sept. 27, 1418, there are entries of payments to pilots (*lodemanni*) for bringing him from St Malo to Southampton "ad presentiam regis."

⁶ On Oct. 27, 1417, Rym. ix. 506; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 189.

⁷ Blanchard, no. 1284; cf. Lobineau, i. 533, ii. 925.

⁸ *Ibid.* ii. 922; Vita, 125.

⁹ Juv. 534.

¹⁰ Rym. ix. 511, 516; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 208, 214; Tit. Liv. 45. During the duke's stay at Alençon his expenses were borne by the English purse.

his sovereign, even though he never admitted that he had actually become an ally of England¹. At the same time he negotiated a similar agreement² on behalf of Yolande, duchess of Anjou, as guardian of her young son Louis, who had just succeeded to the dukedom at fourteen years of age. Very soon after his father's death he had been contracted in marriage to the duke of Brittany's eldest daughter Isabel³; but Yolande's policy is remarkable, for her daughter Marie was betrothed to the new dauphin Charles, who was closely identified with the interests of the Armagnacs. Her husband, however, had counselled reconciliation on his death-bed; and indeed the French king had given her permission to negotiate with the invader with the object of securing her son's possessions from molestation⁴. As for Henry, glad no doubt to secure the neutrality of a powerful opponent on the southern confines of his conquests, he agreed to abstain from any further attack upon Anjou and Maine. One curious result of these agreements was that Henry and his troops henceforth enjoyed a steady supply of fresh lampreys from Nantes⁵, but fresh lampreys were as nothing compared with the freedom he secured for a movement east to strike at the heart of all remaining opposition⁶.

The autumn, however, was over, and according to the military practice of the time Henry should have put his men into warm quarters and spent the winter months in preparing for a spring campaign. Such a course was the more advisable as his army, small as it was at first, had been diminished as each capture drew off a substantial portion to act as garrison, while desertions, which had been numerous since the very landing, were still being reported daily even after the fall of Caen⁷. But the great rock fortress of Falaise still remained uncaptured, and thither, in his unrelenting zeal, Henry despatched the army. The

¹ Juv. 534, 538.

² Rym. ix. 513; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 212.

³ On July 3, 1417 (Blanchard, nos. 1244, 1277; Morice, i. 463). The marriage never took place.

⁴ On Nov. 10, 1417 (Morice, i. 464; Ramet, iii. 75, E. 179; Cosneau, Connétable, 50). Yolande was very much in earnest: her envoys arrived within a few days to arrange details (Rym. ix. 515; Rot. Norm., Hardy, 215), and she pledged all her lands to the duke of Brittany as security for her full performance of her side of the bargain (Ramet, iii. 75). In some quarters in France she was applauded for acting upon sound advice ("salubri usa consilio," St Denys, vi. 162).

⁵ Rym. ix. 644; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 249.

⁶ Friendly negotiations with Brittany and Anjou continued (Rym. ix. 550; Rot. Norm., Hardy, 307).

⁷ Ibid. 329.

earl of Salisbury, who was sent in advance to prevent the inhabitants from leaving the town, had some sharp fights before the main force arrived. On Dec. 1 Henry took up his quarters before the gate on the road to Caen¹. On his right at Guibray² was the duke of Gloucester, while the duke of Clarence faced the castle on the north³. The town of Falaise, with its walls and towers and the majestic castle on the cliff, was redolent of the story of Duke William the Bastard and his mother Arlette, who dwelt at the tannery on the Ante in the valley below. All the chances were in favour of the besieged had there been any hope of ultimate relief. The castle and the projecting rock were practically impregnable, and the winter was setting in with exceptional severity. Moreover, the garrison was heartened by the presence of many refugees from Caen and other places, who were resolved to make a desperate resistance. But Henry was undismayed. He put up huts made of logs bound with withies and roofed with turf, and his force was thus shielded from the worst rigours of the weather. He trenched his camp and fenced it with a palisade. Then, having secured an ample supply of good provisions, he sat down with the fixed resolve to starve the Frenchmen out. Again and again they sallied forth to break the blockade, but the English were more than ready for them, and each time they fell back baffled. Within the defences the ground was frozen hard, and hailstorms brought torrents of discomfort, while the guns played on the broken roofs and walls from the high ground of Guibray. Some of the gun-stones, found in the moat, are startling in their enormous size⁴, and it is no wonder that the clock-tower, the conduits, churches, and houses, crashed under them as they fell⁵. Then came the inevitable disheartenment and disunion, and in spite of the determination of Olivier de Mauny⁶, who was charged with the defence of the place, resistance grew feebler when the walls were breached, and it was not long before negotiations for

¹ Tit. Liv. 46; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 227.

² Galeron, 25, 66, Statistique, i. 5, 8; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 33.

³ Tit. Liv. 46; Vita, 128.

⁴ Galeron, Stat. i. 86. Three which lay at the castle entrance in 1904 each measured about 2 ft. in diameter.

⁵ For repairs to walls, clock, and conduits, see Rym. ix. 565; Galeron, Stat. i. 89. See also *ibid.* i. 350 for the destruction of the tower and nave of the church of the Trinity. The nave was rebuilt in 1438 (*ibid.* i. 95, 351). The fury of the bombardment seems to have impressed itself on contemporary opinion (cf. Wals. ii. 327; St Denys, vi. 164 sq.).

⁶ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 245, 251, 308; Vita, 132; St Denys, vi. 166.

surrender were opened¹. On Dec. 20 an appointment was drawn up by which it was agreed that the town should yield if no relief came by the morning of Jan. 2. Refugees from places previously captured by the English were to be at the king's mercy; English prisoners held in the town were to be freely released; the town garrison were to depart, leaving behind their bows and artillery; and in the meantime everything in the town should as far as possible be left as it was. It was expressly stipulated that, save for the release of the prisoners, the castle was not to be considered as included in the compact². No help came within the appointed time³, and after spending Christmas in the camp, the king entered Falaise on Jan. 2, 1418, and soon afterwards took up his quarters within the town.

His energy was now devoted to the reduction of the castle⁴, the position of the two sides being henceforth reversed, for the English had to attack from the lower ground, and their guns could make no impression on the castle walls, which towered high out of effective range. Mining was likewise useless, for the castle rested on the solid rock. So the attackers bridged the moat on the town side, pushed up shelters to the foot of the walls, and set to work with pick and hammer to loosen the bottom course of stones, creeping into the base of the walls after one or two stones had been removed and working away in the shelter thus secured until they had enlarged the breach to a width of forty yards. The besieged, inspired by Olivier de Mauny, made a gallant defence, lowering lighted faggots on chains to smoke out the English at their work; but the attackers unhooked and extinguished the faggots and persisted in their undertaking. Finding themselves outmatched at all points, the garrison beat a parley and on Feb. 1 agreed to surrender if not relieved within fifteen days⁵. Accordingly, the English were admitted to the castle on Feb. 16⁶, and all

¹ The foregoing narrative is based mainly on Livius (46 sqq.), who gives by far the best account of the siege. The Vita Henrici (129 sqq.) follows him closely, but adds one or two details of interest.

² Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 312 sqq.

³ The French, however, had made some overtures for peace while the siege was proceeding (Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 362).

⁴ Tit. Liv. (48 sq.) is still our main authority, supplemented as before by Vita, 133 sqq.

⁵ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 308; Vita, 137; Greg., Chron. 258; Kingsford, Chron. p. xv.

⁶ For a document dated in the castle at Falaise on Feb. 16, see Rym. ix. 544. Among those who stood out to the last was a Welshman, Edward ap Griffith, who refused to surrender with the town and kept up the fight in the castle. He was tried, found guilty, and executed; his body was quartered and the pieces were sent to be fixed on the gates of Caen, Lisieux, Alençon, and Verneuil (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 364; Lechaudé d'Anisy, vii. 284).

resistance was at an end. Contrary to the usual custom Olivier de Mauny and the garrison were retained as prisoners¹, though six days after the surrender he received a safe-conduct to proceed to Paris, on the understanding that he would be back by April 3². On March 24, 1418, the king restored all the ancient privileges of the town³, and soon afterwards⁴ made grants from the proceeds of the salt-tax to pay for repairing damage wrought to the walls and towers during the siege, subsequently sanctioning the levy of a tax on wine, beer, cider, and other drinks for the same purpose⁵. To strengthen the defences he extended some pools that the besieged had dug at the southern base of the cliff, and one of these exists as a horse-pond to this day⁶. The late captain received his liberty on June 28, 1418, by which time he had taken a vigorous part in repairing the ditches and walls of the castle, according to one of the terms of the capitulation⁷.

By the end of February the king was back at Caen⁸; but he soon moved to Bayeux⁹. Contemporary writers assert that this visit to the cathedral city was for the purpose of prayer, fasting and Lenten devotion¹⁰; but though this motive may have had its influence, more worldly considerations were as usual uppermost. Henry, in fact, wished to keep in touch with important military operations that were taking place towards the west.

On Oct. 1 Gilbert Talbot had been appointed captain-general of the Marches of Normandy¹¹, a term which apparently meant the region on the right flank of the main English advance. Some time in the winter he led a raid into the Cotentin with 500 or 600 men. As they returned they were overtaken by the tide while attempting to cross the bay of Les Veys opposite Isigny, got entangled in the shifting sands, and though by hard

¹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 309; Tit. Liv. 49.

² Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 251.

³ Bréquigny, 67; Galeron, Stat. i. 89. For a detailed statement of them, dated April 11, 1418, see Bréquigny, 15.

⁴ In May, 1418 (Rym. ix. 589; Caumont, Journal, 307; Vautier, 27).

⁵ On April 3, 1419 (Bréquigny, 67).

⁶ Tit. Liv. 46; Vita, 127; Galeron, Stat. i. 69. The great round tower, which is now the most striking feature of the castle ruins, dates from the English occupation of the next thirty years. Its name recalls the great John Talbot, who likewise decorated the walls of some of the rooms and rebuilt the chapel of St Prix in the keep (Freeman, ii. 176; Galeron, 70, 71, 78; D. Turner, ii. 268; Duchesne, Antiquitez, ii. 396).

⁷ Bréquigny, 208; Galeron, Stat. i. 94; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 309; Juv. 538.

⁸ For documents dated at Caen, Feb. 24-28, see Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 254; Chanc. Warr., Ser. 1, 1364/45.

⁹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 262.

¹⁰ Tit. Liv. 50; Vita, 165.

¹¹ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 171.

fighting they escaped from the plunderers who swarmed out of Carentan to harass their retreat, they suffered some loss of life and were compelled to abandon their baggage¹. It was probably because of this incident that Talbot was relieved of his post on Jan. 28². Soon afterwards, however, the duke of Gloucester was sent west with a considerable force, and surrenders followed wherever his troops appeared. Vire capitulated on Feb. 21³. By March 10 the castle of Hambye had surrendered⁴; the town of St Lô followed on the 12th⁵. Four days later they were followed by Le Hommet⁶, Carentan⁷, and Coutances, the last falling to the earl of Huntingdon, who had been specially commissioned to operate in that region⁸. St Sauveur-le-Vicomte submitted on March 25⁹, Pont d'Ouve two days afterwards¹⁰; and about the same time a similar fate befell the castles of Torigny¹¹, Valognes¹², Bricquebec¹³, Néhou¹⁴, and La Haye du Puits¹⁵. Avranches, Pontorson, and other places in the vicinity had been occupied by April 16¹⁶. About this time Henry went back to Caen¹⁷.

[Nearly all Lower Normandy was now in English hands, and Henry had shown that he meant to act, not as a foreign conqueror, but as the kindly lord of territory that was lawfully his. Civil government was already working in the way familiar to the Normans. By the time that Henry set out on his summer campaign there were four English *baillis*—John Popham for Caen¹⁸, Roland Lenthall for Alençon¹⁹, John Ashton for the Cotentin²⁰, and John Radcliffe for Évreux²¹. These *bailliages* were divided into fourteen *vicomtés*, all, or nearly all, of which

¹ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 180, (Hellot) 32; Adam of Usk, 131.

² Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 373.

³ Ibid. 289.

⁴ Rym. ix. 553. It is near Gavray (Manche). On March 13 it was granted to the earl of Suffolk (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 319).

⁵ Ibid. 298 sqq.

⁶ Rym. ix. 555. On March 29 it was granted to Edward count of Mortain (Bréquigny, 10).

⁷ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 300 sqq.

⁸ Ibid. 296 sqq., 382 sq.

⁹ Rym. ix. 565; Gesta, 120; Delisle, 248, 334.

¹⁰ Rym. ix. 566.

¹¹ Tit. Liv. 50; Vita, 51.

¹² Tit. Liv. 50; Norm. Chron. 182.

¹³ Tit. Liv. 50; Vita, 142. It was granted to the earl of Suffolk (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 319).

¹⁴ Tit. Liv. 50; Gesta, 120.

¹⁵ Granted to John Cheyne (Bréquigny, 12).

¹⁶ D.K.R. xli. 708.

¹⁷ D.K.R. xli. passim; Vita, 165.

¹⁸ Appointed Dec. 24, 1417, Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 231 sq.

¹⁹ Appointed March 8, 1418, *ibid.* 278 sq.

²⁰ Appointed March 14, 1418, Bréquigny, 61.

²¹ Appointed May 2, 1418, some weeks before the town was taken (D.K.R. xli. 713).

were administered by Normans¹. The central government of the conquered area was provided for by the appointment of Philip Morgan as chancellor² and the establishment of a *chambre des comptes* at Caen, with John Tiptoft as president³.

Henry was manifestly anxious to reconcile the Normans to their changed lot. On April 12 a general pardon was offered to all whose annual income was under £60 a year, provided that they took the oath of allegiance before June 1. For a fee of 10*d.* anyone might get a sealed ticket testifying to his submission; even escaped prisoners were to have the full benefit of the offer⁴. During the winter and spring many religious houses received back their temporalities⁵. Henry, indeed, was slow to bestow Norman estates, whether clerical or lay, on his followers. Towards the end of the winter, however, grants of land to Englishmen begin to appear frequently in the Norman rolls, though before May 1 their number was only about forty⁶. The calendar of Norman rolls in the 41st and 42nd reports of the Deputy-keeper of the Public Records fails to indicate the most important part of each grant, and has given the impression that the Englishmen who received lands commonly owed nothing in return save some trivial object like a dagger, a pole-axe, a belt, or a hawk. In point of fact, however, those whose property included a castle were usually required to man it adequately⁷, while others were generally laid under the obligation of defending some neighbouring stronghold or town at their own expense with all their available men whenever they were called upon to do so⁸. Later it was usually stipulated in addition that the recipient of a grant of land should serve in the field when required with a certain number of men-at-arms and archers⁹, so that Henry was provided with a force which cost the Treasury nothing and could be used either for the defence

¹ D.K.R. xli. 710 et passim.

² Rym. ix. 571.

³ See below, p. 250. The early arrangements for the government of the English conquests are in many respects obscure. On this subject Dr Wylie left no material that could be used, and detailed examination is best deferred until it can be made in the light of Henry's final adjustment of Norman administration.

⁴ Rym. ix. 573.

⁵ *Ibid.* passim.

⁶ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), passim; D.K.R. xli. passim.

⁷ e.g. Rot. Norm. 6 Hen. V, p. 1, mm. 31, 33, 38, 40.

⁸ Rot. Norm. (Hardy) and Rot. Norm. 6 Hen. V, passim. "High justice" was reserved by the king except in the case of one or two great men such as the duke of Clarence (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 318) or John Grey (*ibid.* 281). Frenchmen who received back their lands had as a rule to render merely the customary services.

⁹ This proviso appears once or twice in grants prior to May 1, 1418 (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 319 sq.; Rot. Norm. 6 Hen. V, p. 2, m. 13), but as yet it was rare.

of Normandy or for the reinforcement of the army with which he was prosecuting his conquests.

Henry's reluctance to dispose of the lands he had conquered was doubtless due to his hope that the entire population of Normandy would accept his rule, and as an additional inducement he announced, early in May, an important modification of the unpopular *gabelle* or salt-tax. Henceforth there were to be no salt-garners save those of the government. All salt imported into Normandy was to be taken to one or other of these, where a tax of 25 per cent. *ad valorem* would be exacted from purchasers. This was no abolition of the *gabelle*, as some have described it, but it greatly reduced the tax, which had been 50 or even 75 per cent., and, what was even more important, once the tax had been paid the salt might be freely sold at whatever price it would fetch. Most welcome of all, however, was the removal of the obligation to buy a certain quantity of salt every three months whether one wanted it or not. It may be doubted, nevertheless, whether the Normans considered the reform sufficient to warrant the grandiloquent contrast between the tyrannous Charles and the benevolent Henry which was drawn in the proclamation announcing it¹.]

While King Henry was at Caen, he was visited by Vincent Ferrer, the famous saint, preacher, and reformer. Vincent had been at Constance, and had then moved westward across France in response to letters of the duke of Brittany, who had invited the holy man to come and instruct him and his subjects². He entered Brittany in February, 1418, and began what proved to be his last evangelistic tour. In April he arrived at Rennes, and while he was there a herald came bearing an invitation for him to visit King Henry in Normandy³. The invitation was accepted, and it is calculated that he was at Caen for some time after May 4, 1418⁴. Only two English chroniclers mention his visit to Henry, and one of these says that it occurred during the siege of Rouen⁵; but circumstantial details are supplied by witnesses who gave evidence at the enquiry held with a view to his canonisation, which took place in 1455. The saint preached

¹ Rym. ix. 584 sq. For the *gabelle*, see Viollet, Institutions, iii. 451; Pérouse, 92, 98.

² Le Mené, Diocèse, i. 397; Fages, ii. 207 sq.; Blanchard, nos. 1272-4; Lobineau, Saints, ii. 195.

³ Ranzani, 480.

⁴ Mouillard, 41; Blanchard, Vincent, 385.

⁵ Otterbourne, 280; First Life, 130 sqq.

before the king, performed a notable miracle in his presence, and, it is said, predicted the death of the count of Armagnac, which happened in June¹. [The writer of the "First English Life of Henry V" has an interesting account², which he gives on the authority of the earl of Ormonde, and which ought not to be wholly discredited by the fact that he makes Vincent's visit an episode in the siege of Rouen. He says that Vincent came uninvited and preached before the king with "marvellous audacitie," denouncing him for destroying "even Christians that had not offended him." The king heard him quietly to the end, but afterwards, summoning Vincent to his presence, declared himself to be the scourge of God, sent to punish God's people for their sins. He then conversed with the friar alone for two or three hours. As Vincent passed through the hall on leaving, he spoke to those who were present, among them some of the chief English captains, and exhorted them to serve the king well; for, so far from being the tyrant Vincent had supposed him, he was the best man present that day, and his quarrel was so just and true that undoubtedly God was with him. It is difficult to believe that there is no truth in this story, but one's attitude towards it must depend on one's general view of the credibility of those passages in the "First English Life" which are derived from the earl of Ormonde³. The saintly and (it appears) rather guileless Vincent returned to Brittany, where in less than a year he died.]

¹ Pages, ii. 216 sq., 218 sq., 226, 246 sq.; Mouillard, 203, 226; Otterbourne, 280.

² Pages 130 sqq.

³ On this see App. Z².

CHAPTER LIII

CIVIL STRIFE IN FRANCE

WHILE Henry was working out his comparatively easy task in Normandy, his work elsewhere was being done for him by the French themselves. Warnings of the coming invasion had certainly reached Paris more than five months before Henry landed¹, but instead of preparing resistance on the coast the French directed their efforts to strengthening the defences of the capital and taking other measures to enable it to stand a siege², the enemy they really had in mind being not the English but the duke of Burgundy³. Frightful lawlessness prevailed throughout the land. Life and property were unsafe in town and country alike, and brigands made travelling almost impossible.

The king had sunk into incurable decay⁴. After the death of the dauphin Louis in December, 1415, all intrigues had as their object the capture and control of the new dauphin John. For the moment the game was in the hands of the duke of Burgundy, who had the nine points of possession. The boy was barely eighteen, yet for ten years he had been kept away from France and brought up in Hainault under the eye of the duke's sister Margaret, who had just married him to her only daughter Jacqueline. In the autumn of 1416 the Council, which the death of the duke of Berry had left under the influence of the duke of Anjou, summoned the new heir to come to Paris without the duke of Burgundy⁵, and an effort at reconciliation was made, the mediators being the count of Holland and the duke of Brittany, the former as a friend of France and the father of the dauphin's wife and the latter as a friend of both Burgundy and Anjou. The duke of Burgundy showed himself

¹ [Le Moyen Age, ser. II, xx. 31 sq.]

² Ordonnances, x. 407, 420 sq.; Douët d'Arcq, i. 390; St Denys, vi. 84, 86.

³ Monstr. iii. 204 sq., 207 sq.; Le Fèvre, i. 307; Löher, i. 276. [Cf. Le Moyen Age, ser. II, xx. 318 sqq.]

⁴ [On Charles VI's insanity see Dodu, 161 sqq., the most recent discussion of the subject.]

⁵ This was apparently in November (Monstr. iii. 167).

but little disposed towards peace, and Anjou retired to Angers about Christmas¹. The count of Holland, however, showed some independence, refused, not for the first time, to hand over the dauphin to the duke, and, with the latter's consent, took the dauphin and Jacqueline towards Paris². Great caution was observed by all parties. For many weeks the count's company lay at Compiègne, whence they treated with Queen Isabel, who had come as far as Senlis. No progress, however, was made; and a visit of the count's to Paris in the hope of accelerating an agreement was abruptly terminated owing, as he said, to the discovery of a plot against his freedom. On his return to Compiègne he found the dauphin grievously sick of a mysterious ailment, and a few days later, on April 4, 1417³, he died. It was asserted and widely believed that he had been poisoned by the Armagnacs. The truth of the matter seems unattainable; what is certain is that the accusation exacerbated party feeling, already bitter enough. To make the prospects of peace still worse, if that was possible, the count of Holland died a few weeks later at Bouchain in consequence of a bite of a dog⁴. The duke of Burgundy visited him on his death-bed and was accused of having poisoned him⁵.

The duke had already begun reprisals for the death of the dauphin. In most of the towns of northern France his partisans were getting the upper hand, for as the exactions of the Armagnacs increased the townsmen turned to him for relief. On April 25, 1417⁶, he issued a manifesto to his supporters at Rouen, charging the Armagnacs with having poisoned the dauphin, likening them to Judas, and declaring that he would relieve the country of taxes and recover her liberty. Letters in the same strain were sent to Amiens, Auxerre, Châlons, Rheims, and Troyes⁷, while his followers roamed at will through Champagne, Burgundy, Picardy, and Brie⁸. The duke pushed his

¹ St Denys, vi. 50.

² Monstr. iii. 166; D. Sauvage, 247; Barante, iii. 190; Morosini, ii. 120.

³ St Denys, vi. 58; Monstr. iii. 168; Marest, 29; D. Sauvage, 248; Paradin, Bourgogne, 605; Löher, i. 271.

⁴ On May 30. Dynter, iii. 342; Monstr. iii. 173; Impens, 358; Zantfliet, 408; Locre, 500.

⁵ Itin. 433; Monstr. iii. 203 sqq.; Cordeliers, 234.

⁶ St Denys, vi. 74; Juv. 533; Monstr. iii. 184 sqq. For full text, see D. Godefroy, Charles VI, 679.

⁷ St Denys, vi. 78; Juv. 533.

⁸ St Denys, vi. 64.

preparations forward while negotiating a marriage between the widowed Jacqueline and his nephew the duke of Brabant. The Flemish towns granted him 100,000 gold crowns¹; he hired 20,000 men from Savoy²; and about the time when Henry landed at Touques he marched westward from Arras at the head of more than 30,000 fighting men³. At Amiens, Beauvais, and Senlis⁴ he was tumultuously welcomed. Resistance was first encountered at the bridge over the Oise at Beaumont, but on Sept. 5 the place was reduced, owing partly to the treachery of the lord of L'Isle Adam, and the duke thus secured one of the main approaches to Paris from the north. Six days later Pontoise fell⁵. The army then crossed the Seine by the bridge at Meulan. The duke's purpose was to starve Paris into submission, and he speedily captured Mantes, Versailles, and Monthéry⁶. For some time the Armagnacs were content to remain behind the walls, and refused to make a sortie even when the Burgundians occupied St Cloud, Vaugirard, and Châtillon, and the duke set up his standard on the heights of Montrouge⁷. The many partisans of Burgundy in the city were kept under strict control and given no opportunity of aiding the besiegers⁸. Food, however, became very dear, and the anxieties of the authorities must have been increased by a despairing appeal for help from Caen to which they could only reply by barren exhortations to courage⁹. Nevertheless on Sept. 30 the Armagnacs plucked up heart and captured the bridge at Beaumont-sur-Oise¹⁰—an event which greatly dashed the spirits of the Burgundians, already depressed by the delay before the capital. An attack of the Burgundians on the bridge over the Seine at St Cloud was foiled, and breaking up from there they tried to secure the bridge at Corbeil and thus to stop the transport of supplies to Paris from the east¹¹. But here again they failed, and the duke, fearing that his army would melt away under the rigours of winter¹², was contemplating retreat when he was offered an unexpected chance of retrieving his fortunes.

¹ Roye, 172; J. Meyer, 252.

² Trahisons de France, 132.

³ Plancher, iii. 472-475, 590-595.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 191, 209, 211; Le Fèvre, i. 298, 300, 309, 310; Cordeliers, 235; St Denys, vi. 80, 86; Itin. 435; Flammermont, 200; Thierry, ii. 70.

⁵ St Denys, vi. 116; Itin. 435.

⁶ St Denys, vi. 122; Itin. 436.

⁷ St Denys, vi. 130.

⁸ Ibid. 131 sq.

⁹ Ibid. 108.

¹⁰ Ibid. 136.

¹¹ Cousinot, 165; Cordeliers, 241; Dognon, 496.

¹² Monstr. iii. 226; Cousinot, 166; Raoulet, 160; Trahisons, 134.

The troubles of the time, which had driven the government to exact ruinous taxes and forced loans and even to strip the shrine of St Louis of its gold and jewels¹, had wrought no abatement in the luxury and extravagance of the court, where the profligacy of Queen Isabel became more and more scandalous. She had long ceased to live with her husband, who had taken a violent dislike to her and comforted himself with Oudine or Odette de Champdivers—a harmless and colourless creature very different from the romantic heroine that modern imagination has made of her. Though forty-seven years old, the queen became increasingly the slave of pleasure, till at length the king became for a moment jealous of his honour, ordered the arrest of Louis Bosredon, master of the queen's household and reputed to be one of her lovers, and a few days later had him tied up in a sack and thrown into the Seine. It was thought advisable to send the queen away, and about the end of May, 1417², she was removed first to the castle of Blois and then to that of Tours³, where she was cut off from all chance of interfering with the government, no letters being allowed to reach her, and lived, as she said, "in great misery and displeasure⁴." Vast sums of money which she had amassed and much of her jewellery and other property were seized by the government⁵. Hitherto Isabel had cordially hated the duke of Burgundy⁶, but desire for revenge now led her to send him an offer of co-operation against a common enemy⁷. The duke, who was then at Chartres meditating a withdrawal from before Paris, eagerly accepted the alliance, and a well-laid scheme resulted in his rescuing Isabel from her guards at the abbey of Marmoutier, just outside Tours, as she was hearing Mass there on All Souls' day⁸. A secret understanding was at once signed, and the duke returned to Chartres, where the queen joined him⁹. While the duke had been passing along the valley

¹ Ordonnances, x. 437; St Denis, vi. 224, 226; Juv. 533; Boutiot, ii. 380. The monks of St Denis, moreover, had to pawn their relics and sell much of their treasure in order to raise 3000 crowns demanded by the government; they also thought it wise to hide the great shrine enclosing the body of St Denis (St Denis, vi. 68).

² Bourgeois, 78.

³ Juv. 533, 537; Le Fèvre, i. 242; Monstr. iii. 176.

⁴ Ordonnances, x. 424, 437; Boutiot, ii. 381; Cousinot, 164.

⁵ Ibid. 165; Pétigny, 330; Vallet de Virville, Isab. 237.

⁶ St Denis, vi. 140; Belleforest, Chron. 322; Thibault, 426.

⁷ Monstr. iii. 227 sqq.

⁸ Ordonnances, x. 427; Juv. 537; Vallet de Virville, i. 74.

⁹ Itin. 436; Le Fèvre, i. 317.

of the Loir, he had been on the very flank of the English force that was operating against the fortresses of Maine, but he gave no sign of any desire to resist it; and while he was at Chartres after his return, his ally the duke of Brittany was making terms with Henry at Alençon, some sixty miles away.

The duke now appeared again before Paris, having reason to expect that the gates would be opened to him by his partisans in the town. The plot, however, had been discovered and stamped out¹, and the bishop of Paris excommunicated the duke at Notre Dame on the very day when he had hoped to enter the city². It is true that the plight of Paris was bad, despite plundering raids in the neighbourhood by the Armagnacs³; but the duke of Burgundy, despairing of speedy success, moved eastward in December, and, accompanied by the queen, entered Troyes two days before Christmas⁴.

At Chartres Isabel had issued a manifesto announcing that she took upon herself the regency of France and that she would support the duke of Burgundy in his effort to save the country⁵. She set up a high court at Amiens to take the place of the *Parlement* of Paris for the *bailliages* of Amiens, Vermandois, Senlis, and Tournay, and for Ponthieu⁶, and as money began to come in, there seemed some hope of the establishment of a settled government. At Troyes the queen continued her attempt to capture all political authority. She issued an ordinance dismissing the *Parlement* of Paris, and created a substitute of her own, the officers of which were all to be appointed by herself⁷. She made the duke of Burgundy governor of the kingdom, and bestowed the office of constable on Charles duke of Lorraine⁸. She was visited by ambassadors from Hainault⁹ and Brittany¹⁰ and even from the kings of Castile¹¹ and Portugal¹². Her most notable triumphs, however,

¹ Juv. 537 sq.; Monstr. iii. 237 sq.; Le Fèvre, i. 318; Denifle, Chart. iv. 331; Douët d'Arcq, i. 393.

² Ordonnances, x. 428; St Denys, vi. 156; Beaucourt, i. 27; Félibien, iv. 574; Denifle, Chart. iv. 332.

³ St Denys, vi. 142; Bourgeois, 80, 81.

⁴ Itin. 437; Gachard, 238.

⁵ Monstr. iii. 230 sqq.; Le Fèvre, i. 318.

⁶ Monstr. iii. 234 sq. Philippe de Morvilliers was chancellor of this court and had a seal with the queen's effigy. For the seal, see Pasquier, 59; Thierry, ii. 77.

⁷ Ordonnances, x. 436-442.

⁸ Plancher, III. pp. cccii, 481, 482; Gachard, 286; Boutiot, ii. 378, 379.

⁹ Itin. 438; Gachard, 238.

¹⁰ Itin. 439.

¹¹ On Jan. 28, 1418 (ibid. 438).

¹² March 26, 1418 (ibid. 439).

were gained in southern France. Languedoc, where the governor was John viscount of Lomagne, eldest son of the count of Armagnac, was seething with discontent on account of the heavy taxation¹, and quite ready to listen to envoys from the queen advising refusal to pay. For the last year the governor had had his hands full with attempting to repel the English, who were making inroads on the western side of the province. Far down the Garonne he had been trying to expel them from La Réole. He had indeed succeeded in driving them out of the town by April 5, 1417, but they still held out in the castle, and as he was very short of both materials and men, he had to trust to the slow process of a blockade. On April 12 he wrote to Albi for help², and a month later, knowing that the English were looking for a rescue, he sent to Carcassonne asking for the loan of its big gun, at the same time issuing orders for the repair of the roads to let it pass³. By July 7 the English had promised to submit if no help should reach them before the end of August⁴, and they eventually surrendered⁵. In the autumn, however, the new tactics of the duke of Burgundy began to brighten English prospects. From a letter written on Oct. 10, 1417, we know that a large English force was then at Puylagarde (Tarn-et-Garonne), and threatening Albi⁶; while another force pushed northwards across the Charente⁷, captured the castles of Montbron (Charente) and Aixe-sur-Vienne (Haute-Vienne), and plundered up to within two leagues of Limoges, where the fortifications had been allowed to fall into decay⁸. It was while the governor was struggling with these dangers in the west that the emissaries of the queen entered his province from the east. They were soon followed by Louis de Chalon, eldest son of the prince of Orange, who was sent with 500 armed men to abolish taxation. He entered the province on April 2, 1418, and at once began a victorious progress⁹. Very few places resisted him. He was received with joy at

¹ Vaissète, ix. 1035, 1037.

² Compayré, 263.

³ Vaissète, ix. 1037, x. 1893; Mahul, v. 356.

⁴ Vaissète, ix. 1038.

⁵ Drouyn, Guienne, i. 138.

⁶ Compayré, 264.

⁷ For payment to a messenger in 1417 for reporting that the English "passoient la Charente a grant force" and were coming to plant their standards before the walls of St Jean d'Angély, see Aussy, Reg. iii. 239.

⁸ Ordonnances, x. 443.

⁹ Ibid. 431, 433; Compayré, 264; Dognon, 448.

Nîmes, Aigues Mortes, Montpellier, and Narbonne¹. Carcassonne tried to preserve neutrality², and soon the only considerable town in the hands of the Armagnacs was Toulouse, where their position was precarious. Their last hopes vanished at the news of the slaughter of their leaders in Paris. John of Armagnac had already approached the authorities at Bordeaux, offering to do homage to the king of England in order to secure a respite on that side, and a truce between him and the lord of Albret on the one hand, and the English on the other, was concluded before Sept. 1, 1418³.

For some time after the queen and the duke of Burgundy had set up their government at Troyes, it looked as if they would secure recognition throughout the country. The inevitable lack of money, however, soon made itself felt, and the ardour of the keenest Burgundians began to cool under the demands which the government at Troyes was driven to make. France again resounded with clamour for settlement and compromise. As a matter of fact, quite early in the winter negotiations had been opened between Armagnac envoys at Montereau and Burgundian envoys at Bray; but after two months' talk they could do no more than arrange that a meeting should take place at La Tombe after Easter⁴. In the interval an envoy of the duke of Burgundy had conferred with the earl of Warwick at Bayeux and on March 24, 1418, arranged a prolongation till Michaelmas of the truce between his master and Henry⁵, while the duke himself left Troyes on April 5 for Dijon⁶, whence he moved on to Montbéliard in Franche-Comté, where towards the end of May he had a four days' interview with the emperor Sigismund. Nothing is known of the political business discussed⁷, but it was not likely to be to the advantage of France, seeing that Sigismund was preparing

¹ Dognon, 454, 477.

² Vaissète, ix. 1042.

³ Rym. ix. 597, 625; Le Fèvre, i. 338; Cordeliers, 260; Barante, iii. 252.

⁴ Moranvillé, Extraits, 433; St Denys, vi. 172; Le Fèvre, i. 324; Cousinot, 168; Monstr. iii. 246 sq.; Belleforest, Chron. 323; Plancher, iii. 484.

⁵ Rym. ix. 561 sqq. The truce had previously been extended from Michaelmas, 1417, to the following Easter (Rym. ix. 527 sq.; D.K.R. xlv. 595, 598).

⁶ Itin. 439; Gachard, 238.

⁷ For documents of the duke dated at Montbéliard from May 8 to 29, see Plancher, iii. 485, 492; Barante, iii. 237. For documents of Sigismund dated at Mömpelgard, May 25-28, see Altmann, i. 229. It is known that many notable men were present, and that Sigismund brought his heralds and his fools, one of whom tumbled and played the guitar to amuse the duke (Itin. 612; Monstr. iii. 249).

to assert by force a claim to Dauphiné and other eastern provinces of France¹ and intended to invade France with a large army and join Henry in Normandy²—a project which came to nothing owing to the Hussite rising in Bohemia and the hostility of some of the German princes³.

¹ On June 2, 1418, the estates of Dauphiné were ordered to assemble and to resist Sigismund (Ordonnances, x. 414).

² Rym. ix. 604, 605.

³ Lenz, 196, 200.

CHAPTER LIV

THE FATE OF OLDCASTLE

IF we judged merely from the documents printed by Rymer in the *Fœdera*, we might suppose that on the departure of the king from Southampton the interest of Englishmen in the life of their own country was entirely suspended, for with the exception of some letters from the Council of Constance and records of the appointment of one or two bishops, what he has printed refers solely to affairs in Normandy. But a very different impression would probably have been given by a report from the duke of Bedford, who had been left behind as lieutenant, keeper, or protector of the kingdom¹. Of his personal influence we have few traces. The affairs of the nation were being smoothly administered from Westminster. Under the deputy-treasurer, William Kynwolmersh², money came in with complete regularity; receipts were large and domestic expenditure small, so that, notwithstanding the invasion of Normandy, the revenue for the year seems to have been sufficient to cover the out-goings³.

Nevertheless, there was an uneasy sense of danger in the country. Wales, indeed, was quiet, the death of Owen Glendower having been followed by the surrender of his son Meredith; but Oldcastle was still at large and Scotland still aggressive. In spite of the violent preaching of several of the higher clergy⁴, it is clear that many priests continued to favour Oldcastle⁵, and no person or community had ventured to lay hand on him despite the enormous rewards offered. For nearly

¹ "Lieutenant au Roi et gardein d'Engleterre," Rot. Parl. iv. 111; "custos," Rym. ix. 600, 601; "gardianus," Cotton MS. Cleop. E. 11. f. 332 d. He received an allowance of 8000 marks a year (Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., Nov. 14, 1420 et passim).

² Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 218, 239. He had been appointed by Henry Fitzhugh, July 8, 1417, and confirmed in the office next day (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 109).

³ [Dr Wylie and Professor Newhall (p. 144) both reached this conclusion, though the totals which they extracted from the Issue and Receipt Rolls differ. In any case such calculations have little value.]

⁴ For sermons preached against him by Bishop Mascall in Herefordshire and Shropshire, see Dict. Nat. Biogr. xxxvi. 406.

⁵ John Prest, vicar of Chesterton in Warwickshire, actually harboured him early in August, 1415 (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 372; Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 14 d).

four years he had hidden in the hills and solitudes of the west, though where he stayed cannot be exactly ascertained. Some say that he went to Wales¹, others that he haunted the neighbourhood of Oswestry and Shrewsbury², while tradition still connects him with an ancient house in the Darval or Deerfold to the west of Wigmore in Herefordshire. But though Lollardy as typified in its hunted leader dared not show itself in the open, yet its fire was ever ready to burst into flame. When the king was leaving for Harfleur in 1415, Oldcastle was astir in the midlands, but the timely discovery of Scrope's plot at Southampton ruined all chance of a Lollard success³. There were more alarms in the winter of 1416-1417. When the king was at Kenilworth for Christmas it was discovered that one of Oldcastle's squires was plotting to kill him⁴. On Dec. 26 seditious schedules were found fixed on the windows of the principal houses in Reading, Northampton, and St Albans⁵, and no one could trace their origin, while at the same time many similar writings were dropped with impunity even in the streets of London⁶. On Jan. 23, 1417⁷, proclamations were issued renewing the offer of 1000 marks reward for Oldcastle's capture, together with perpetual exemption from taxation for any city or borough which should give him up, or a grant of £20 a year to any person doing so. The offers of pardon to repentant Lollards that had been made at the time of Oldcastle's escape had already been repeated⁸, with an intimation that the offer would hold good if submissions were made within a fortnight after Michaelmas, 1417. Neither announcement, however, had as yet produced any result. The Lollards, in fact, became bolder than they had been for some time. A member of a west-country family well known for their Lollard leanings, Henry Greindor⁹ of Clowerwell in the Forest of Dean, approached the king with a petition that he would take all the Church's property into his own hand, merely it seems to assert his abstract right to it, for Greindor was willing

¹ Hardyng, 372; "in Powysia," Usk, 131.

² Strecche, 266 a.

³ Vol. i. 519 sqq.

⁴ Wals. ii. 317.

⁵ Ibid.; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 147, 151.

⁶ Otterb. 278; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 151.

⁷ Claus. 4 Hen. V, 7 d; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 83; Cotton MS. Cleop. E. ii. f. 319. The proclamations were published only in the midlands and the west.

⁸ On Nov. 16, 1416 (Claus. 4 Hen. V, 12 d).

⁹ Referred to by Elmham (Lib. Metr. 148) as Oldcastle's "preco."

that he should re-grant it to the Church. Henry had him sent to prison for the bare suggestion, saying that he might as well do the same with the property of every one of his subjects and that he would rather be cut to pieces than lay a hand on the Church's goods¹. Not long afterwards Oldcastle himself ventured within a few miles of London. At Barnet the tenants of the abbot of St Albans showed disaffection, which eventually came to rioting, and led to the appointment of a commission of enquiry². It was believed in the abbey that Oldcastle had been staying for some days in the house of a peasant near St Albans; and though he managed to escape when the secret leaked out, many of his sympathisers were caught and clapped into the abbot's prison. Compromising tracts were likewise found, together with primers in which the nimbus round saints' heads had been scratched off and the names of the Virgin and saints rubbed out in many places. One of these books was sent to the king, who forwarded it to Archbishop Chichele with orders that the mutilated pictures should be publicly exposed during sermon time at Paul's Cross as a warning of the lengths to which Lollard frenzy could go³.

Meanwhile the Scots were making great preparations to recover lost ground on the border as soon as the king had left for France. In England it was believed that Oldcastle had had an interview with William Douglas at Pontefract⁴, and it was even said that he had entered into a written agreement with the duke of Albany⁵. It is certain that an understanding did exist, that the duke of Albany was beginning to tire of maintaining the pseudo-Richard at his own expense⁶, and that Lollard emissaries were passing busily about inciting the dalesmen of Yorkshire and Northumberland to be ready to acclaim King Richard as soon as he should appear amongst them. Prominent among these emissaries was a Yorkshire squire

¹ Elmham, loc. cit.; Capgr., *De Illustr.* 121. [The story rests on very slender authority.]

² Dated Sept. 17, 1417 (*Cal. Pat.* 1416-22, p. 143). Cf. *Monast.* ii. 198.

³ *Wals.* ii. 326.

⁴ *Ibid.* 325.

⁵ Otterb. 278, who states that the actual documents had been found; *Stow*, 355.

⁶ A note appears in the Scottish Exchequer Rolls under date of July 12, 1417, showing that the governor—i.e. the duke of Albany—had received no money at all for the custody of Richard king of England since the death of Robert III eleven years before, his claims now amounting to £733. 6s. 8d. or one hundred marks per annum (*Exch. Rolls, Scot.* iv. 289; *Menteith*, i. 229).

named Henry Talbot, from the Forest of Bowland¹. He had already got into trouble owing to intrigues in 1413², and in 1415 had almost succeeded in getting the duke of Albany's son Murdach out of the hands of the English as they were conducting him to the border³. On both of these occasions he had escaped scot-free, but this time he fell into the hands of the king's officers. Enquiries held by the earl of Westmorland and two judges⁴ at Newcastle and at Masham fully established his treason, and he was sent to London. On May 1, 1417, he was brought to Westminster, where he admitted his guilt, saying that he had acted at the instigation of some of the bishops and other churchmen in order to destroy sin in England. Brought up again on May 4, he was personally questioned by the king, and then pleaded that at the last examination he had been frightened and did not know what he was saying. He then put himself on the country, but on June 13 he was sentenced to be drawn from the Tower to Tyburn and there to be beheaded. His head was exposed on London Bridge, and his quarters, wrapped in wax-cloth, were sent in sacks to be exposed on the gates of Chester, Lancaster, Newcastle, and York⁵.

The government continued to be active against Lollardy. On July 23 Thomas Brook, the husband of Oldcastle's step-daughter, had to find security that he would not promote gatherings of his tenants in Somerset or communicate with Oldcastle within the next six months⁶. And about the time that Henry sailed orders were issued to the sheriff of Hampshire for the arrest of two priests, Richard Wyche and William Brown, who were suspiciously connected with money belonging to Oldcastle⁷.

Some time before the king sailed messengers⁸ had arrived with news that the Scots were threatening Roxburgh, and these were soon followed by John Bertram, one of the commanders

¹ Goodwin, 168.

² Vol. i. 34.

³ *Ibid.* 515.

⁴ Richard Norton and James Strangways, *Brit. Mus. Add. MS.* 4601/103 (135).

⁵ These details are known from the record of the charges made by Robert Whittington and John Coventry, the sheriffs of London, who carried out the arrangements for the execution (*For. Accts.* 51, C).

⁶ *Claus.* 5 Hen. V, 18 d.

⁷ Devon, 352, shows that they had been captured before Oct. 21, 1417. Wyche had already been in trouble for heresy, and was destined to die at the stake in 1440 (*Wyllie*, iii. 463 sqq.; *Fascic. Ziz.* 501; *Kingsford, Chron.* 147, 153, 312; *Fabyan*, 613; *Mon. Fran.* ii. 171; *Stow, Chron.* 378).

⁸ For payments to them, see *Iss. Roll* 5 Hen. V, Pasch., Aug. 3, 1417.

of the place, who came in person to Southampton to press for the payment of the wages of his men¹. The warning came none too soon, for in the middle of August two large bodies of Scots were in the field, one under the earl of Douglas prepared for an attack on Roxburgh, the other under the duke of Albany being directed against Berwick². Despite timely warnings from the north³, these movements appear to have taken the English Council by surprise, for as late as Sept. 5 the king was still under the belief that a truce was being arranged for the winter and that troops that would otherwise be needed in the north would thus be available to strengthen the army in Normandy⁴. The duke of Albany, however, found Berwick no easy task to handle. The place was defended with great determination by Robert Umfraville, and the alarm spread with exceptional speed throughout England. No sooner was it known that the Scots were in motion than all England north of the Trent rushed to arms. The duke of Exeter had started a round of pilgrimages, with the intention of visiting York, Durham, and Bridlington⁵, but on hearing of the danger he hastily collected a force and marched northward to the rescue. Archbishop Bowet was drawing near his end; his sight was failing and he was breaking up with age⁶; but his old spirit of fight awoke at the crisis: putting himself at the head of some thousands of his tenantry, and accompanied by Stephen Scrope, archdeacon of Richmond⁷, he drove straight to the scene of danger⁸.

¹ He received £1000 at Southampton (Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Pasch., June 21, 30, and Aug. 3, 1417). He and John Elton were appointed wardens of Roxburgh, with powers "infra bundas de Tevythale" on Jan. 19, 1416 (Rot. Scot. ii. 214).

² Gesta, 121.

³ On July 31 the earl of Northumberland, warden of the East March, wrote from Warkworth that the duke of Albany was purposing to attack Berwick, and on Aug. 3 Robert Umfraville, writing from Berwick itself, said that Albany's force numbered 60,000 men and that the siege would probably begin in twenty days (Fœd. ix. 307, 310; the documents can belong to no other year than 1417, in spite of the difficulty raised by their being written in the king's own name).

⁴ This appears from a letter written from Caen to the chancellor, Bishop Langley, in which he expresses a wish that the duke of Exeter shall cross to Normandy and give help in the campaign there (Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 1364/37).

⁵ Tit. Liv. 56; Gesta, 121; Wals. ii. 325.

⁶ Gesta, 121; Elmham, Lib. Metr. 152; Holinsh. iii. 560. Cf. "pro pare de spektakeles de argento et de aurato," which his executors value at 20s., Test. Ebor. iii. 70; Raine, Hist. York, iii. 312; Wylie, ii. 351.

⁷ Elmham, Lib. Metr. 152. He was nephew of Archbishop Scrope and brother of Henry Scrope, executed for treason in 1415. He was archdeacon of Richmond from March 18, 1402 to his death on Sept. 5, 1418 (Le Neve, iii. 139).

⁸ Tit. Liv. 56; Stow, Chron. 355.

This independent action was well supported by the government. On Aug. 14 and 24 Bedford had called for troops to meet him at Leicester and march thence against the Scots¹. The duke was at the rendezvous by Sept. 20². When the whole force mustered under the lead of the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland at Barmoor near Lowick, its numbers were very great³, and the duke of Exeter is reported to have said that a large proportion of the men were as good as any that were serving in France⁴. In face of such opposition the Scots withdrew precipitately from Berwick, leaving their siege train behind. On the way back Albany set fire to Norham⁵, but this was all the satisfaction that the Scots could reap from what was long remembered as the Foul Raid⁶. At Roxburgh the earl of Douglas had already commenced mining⁷ and was confident that the place could not hold out for more than another fortnight⁸, but he withdrew as soon as he heard of the failure at Berwick⁹. The Scots now sought for peace¹⁰, but the tables were turned, and Robert Umfraville not only harassed their retreat from Berwick, but for the next two years harried them at Hawick, Selkirk and Jedburgh, while all Ettrickdale, Lauderdale, and Teviotdale lay defenceless at his mercy¹¹.

To the Council at Westminster the news of the discomfiture of the Scots must indeed have been welcome, but even more so must have been the messenger who brought news from Wales that John Oldcastle was at last under lock and key. It happened that a parliament, summoned by writs of Oct. 5,

¹ Rym. ix. 307, 310.

² Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Pasch., Sept. 20, 1417; cf. Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 118.

³ Otterb., 278, who gives the number as 60,000; Wals. ii. 325 (100,000); Elmham, Lib. Metr. 151 (100,000); Tit. Liv. 56 (100,000); Vita, 163 (100,000); Hardyng, 380; Stow, Chron. 355. The numbers quoted are of course absurd, but it was evidently believed everywhere that the force was an exceptionally large one. Mr Kingsford thinks that Hardyng was present (E.H.R. xxv. 463).

⁴ Wals. ii. 326. Walsingham says that the duke applied his remark to 40,000 men.

⁵ Hardyng, 380 sq.; Otterb. 279.

⁶ Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1186; Ridpath, 385; Douglas Book, 8, 385; Hume (Godscroft), 125.

⁷ Wals. ii. 325.

⁸ Otterb. 279. The narrow escape of Roxburgh led the English government to strengthen the defences, provide large supplies of weapons, and pay arrears of wages to the garrison (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 146; Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Mich., Dec. 7, 27, 1417, Feb. 1, March 1 and 5, 1418; *ibid.* 6 Hen. V, Pasch., June 1, Sept. 28, July 11, 1418; Cal. Doc. Scot. iv. 176).

⁹ Money was also spent on the strengthening of Berwick (For. Accts. 52, B; Iss. Roll 6 Hen. V, Pasch., April 4, May 9, 1418; *ibid.* Mich., Oct. 10, 1418).

¹⁰ Hardyng, 381.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 382; Goodwin, 169.

met at Westminster on Nov. 16¹. Only one duke—Exeter—and three earls—Northumberland, Westmorland, and Devon—were summoned, and only fourteen barons, none of whose names is new. For the commons there are returns for twenty-six counties and sixty-seven boroughs²; none of the individual members is specially notable. On the opening day Bishop Langley addressed the whole parliament in the Painted Chamber on the words "Take comfort, be men! and ye shall be glorious³." He sang the praises of the king, who had now added to his previous triumphs by conquering many walled towns and castles in Normandy, urging that it was for the country to support the expedition in France and check the malice of the Scots. Then the commons chose Roger Flower to be their speaker for the second time, and the sittings were continued from day to day till Dec. 17 when the members separated after granting two tenths and two fifteenths, one payable at Candlemas next and the other a year later⁴. The southern convocation met at St Paul's on Nov. 26, and sat till Dec. 20⁵, when it granted two tenths, to be levied at the same intervals as those of the commons. The northern convocation met at York on Jan. 20, 1418, granted a tenth, and broke up on Jan. 26⁶. No statute of any kind resulted from the meeting of this parliament, but the southern convocation made an attempt to remedy an acknowledged grievance. For some years complaints had been growing that graduates of the English universities found no preferment in the Church such as they claimed should be their reward after their long years of study⁷. To obviate this evil and check the decay from which the universities were suffering, an order, to hold good for ten years, was promulgated by Archbishop Chichele that every spiritual patron must henceforward select a graduate to fill the first and every third subsequent vacancy

¹ Claus. 5 Hen. V, 11 d; Rot. Parl. iv. 106.

² Return Parl. i. 289 sqq. No returns have been found for Lancashire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire, Rutland, Hampshire, Staffordshire, Suffolk, Warwickshire, Westmorland, Worcestershire, or Yorkshire.

³ 1 Sam. iv. 9—not 1 Cor. xvi. 13, as the speech shows. Neither passage contains the words "et gloriosi eritis."

⁴ Rot. Parl. iv. 107; Usk, 130, 131; Rec. Roll 6 Hen. V, Pasch., April 4, 1418; *ibid.* Mich., Feb. 14, 1419; Dep. Keep. Rept. 2, App. II. p. 187.

⁵ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 4601/145 (184); Conc. iii. 381; D.K.R. 2, App. II. p. 188.

⁶ Conc. ii. 389; Wake, 353.

⁷ Rot. Parl. iv. 81.

in each of his benefices, elaborate provisions being laid down to ensure that those of the most exalted academic rank should get the best positions¹. The proposal, however, encountered objections on the part of the graduates themselves, as it would have entailed certain drastic reforms in the conditions under which degrees were then conferred². Little if anything can have come of the measure, as further legislation was deemed advisable in 1421³.

But if the legislative fruit was scanty, yet the sittings of both parliament and convocation will ever be memorable for the tragedy which marked their close. The belief that Oldcastle was in collusion with the Scots had apparently led the government to redouble its efforts to capture him. When the duke of Bedford was passing through the midlands on his way back from the Border, he had many Lollards seized and thrown into prison⁴. About the middle of October he despatched to John Merbury in Wales a letter which doubtless had its bearing on subsequent events⁵. Early in November the sheriff of Kent was ordered to seize Oldcastle's goods, which long ago had been declared forfeited—a task in which he was resisted by organised bands and required the support of an armed guard⁶. About the same time fresh writs for Oldcastle's arrest were sent to all the sheriffs⁷, while his wife Joan and one of her servants named Simon Clere were sent to the Tower⁸. On Dec. 1 the news of his capture was known in London. The honour of effecting it fell to four Welshmen, two of whom are described as gentlemen and two as yeomen⁹. All were tenants of Edward Charlton lord of Powys¹⁰. The scene of the arrest is said to have been in Powysland, and the only precise statement from a contemporary places it at Welshpool¹¹. There is a tradition,

¹ Conc. iii. 381 sq.

² *Ibid.* 383 sq.

³ See below, pp. 282 sq.

⁴ Elmham, Lib. Metr. 152.

⁵ For payment to the messenger, see Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Mich., Oct. 21, 1417.

⁶ Devon, 353.

⁷ *Ibid.* 349.

⁸ Claus. 5 Hen. V, 7.

⁹ "Jevan and Gruffuth sones of Gruffuth ap Jevan ap Madoc ap Gwennoys of Powys Londe gentilmens and Hoel ap Gruffith ap David ap Madoc and Dero ap Jevan ap Jorum ap Ada of the same Lond, Zemen" (Orig. Lett. 2nd Ser. i. 87). The father of the two gentlemen is called Sir Griffith Vaughan, lord of Burgedin, in Arch. Cambrensis, Ser. I, i. 47.

¹⁰ For a document of June 6, 1420, in which Charlton rewards them for their achievement, see *ibid.*

¹¹ "In villa Walshpole," Strecche, 266 a, who however dates the capture in "Anno IV."

however, that Oldcastle was taken at Broniarth in the parish of Guilsfield, where an enclosure is still known as Cobham's garden¹. His arrest was not achieved without a violent struggle, for he was a man of great bodily strength², but at length he was badly wounded³, overpowered, and carried to the castle at Welshpool, a story soon being current that he was knocked down by a blow from a footstool aimed at his shin by a woman⁴. On Dec. 1 orders were issued to Charlton to bring his prisoner to London with all speed that his case might be taken in hand by the Council⁵. Wounded and broken, Oldcastle was placed in a horse-litter⁶, and, accompanied by a clerk who had been privy to all his secrets, was sent to the capital under a strong guard and lodged in the Tower. On Dec. 14⁷ he was brought before parliament, where the Chief Justice, William Hankford, produced the record of the indictment under which he had been adjudged a traitor four years before. Then Archbishop Chichele read the pronouncement of his excommunication. He was asked if he had any reason to show why these sentences should not take effect. At the outset he appealed to the God of mercy, and cried out that all who would be like God must put mercy before justice, and leave vengeance to Him. At this those present grew impatient and the Chief Justice urged the regent not to tolerate such waste of time. Told to keep more to the point, Oldcastle, after a short silence, exclaimed, "With me it is a small thing that I should be judged of you or of man's day⁸," and then wandered off again into the same irrelevancies⁹. When the Chief Justice called for his final answer, he said defiantly that he recognised no judge there, for his proper judge, King Richard, was in Scotland¹⁰. No witnesses were called or needed; parliament at once declared that he should be drawn, hanged, and burnt; and the sentence was executed without delay¹¹. Taken back to the Tower, he was tied down to the

¹ Arch. Camb., loc. cit.; Montgomeryshire Collections, 290; Robinson, Castles, 4; Tyler, ii. 391, who calls it Lord Cobham's Field and refers to a tradition that it was granted to one of the ancestors of the Ormsby-Gore family as a reward for the capture.

² Wals. ii. 291; Capgr., De Illustr. 122.

³ Leland, Coll. ii. 488; Chron. Ric. II-Hen. VI, 46.

⁴ Capgr., loc. cit.; cf. Elmham, Lib. Metr. 158.

⁵ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 145; Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 4601/142 (181); Tit. Liv. 219.

⁶ Elmham, Lib. Metr. 158; Chron. Ric. II-Hen. VI, 46; Brut, ii. 386; Greg., Chron. 116.

⁷ Rot. Parl. iv. 108.

⁸ 1 Cor. iv. 3.

⁹ Wals. ii. 328.

¹⁰ Cf. Elmham, Lib. Metr. 158.

¹¹ Ibid. 159; Otterb. 280.

hurdle, and drawn through the streets to St Giles' Field¹, where a vast crowd had assembled². The regent, who was present with many other notables, urged him to confess to some priest, but he answered that if the apostles Peter and Paul themselves were there, he would not have them³; and he adjured Sir Thomas Erpingham, who once had been a Lollard like himself, to say a word for his surviving fellows when he had risen again on the third day⁴. A gibbet had already been erected, and faggots piled below; an iron chain was passed about his body⁵; the fire was kindled; and they hung him roasting slowly above it till the flames consumed his body and the gallows as well⁶. No cry escaped him⁷, as he swung in torture so intolerable to modern imagination that some writers have supposed the fire to have been lighted only after he had been hanged. In favour of this view is the evidence of a nearly contemporary authority, who asserts that Oldcastle was "first drawn and hanged, afterwards disembowelled, and cut into pieces, and lastly consumed in the fire⁸." But apart from the fact that no other writer makes any reference to dismembering or disembowelling, it is certain that fire and chain were meant to be two separate portions of a double punishment⁹. Oldcastle had often been spoken of by his friends as Elijah¹⁰, an extravagance which now drew the jeer that he had gone in a chariot of fire to hell¹¹. Remembering his oft-repeated saying that he would rise again on the third day, a crowd assembled two days after his punishment to see if this would come to pass. Finding that no resurrection had taken place, the martyr's friends gathered handfuls of the ashes to rub upon their eyes, which (according to a triumphant canon) only sent them stone blind¹². Such gibes were but a reflex of the callous feeling of England as a whole. For it is clear that his fate roused little passion in the country, and there was none

¹ Grey Friars Chron. 166; Peter. Chron. 488; Kingsford, Chron. 72; For. Accts. 52, A.

² Strecche, 266 a.

³ Elmham, Lib. Metr. 159; Capgr., De Illustr. 122.

⁴ Wals. ii. 328.

⁵ Kingsford, Chron. 72, Lit. 318; Brut, ii. 386.

⁶ Usk, 131; Chron. Lond. 106; Kingsford, Chron. 126; Three Fifteenth Cent. Chrons. 56; Caxton, 229.

⁷ Elmham, Lib. Metr. 159.

⁸ Capgr., De Illustr. 123.

⁹ Gilles de Rais was "pendu et brulé vif" in 1440 (Bossard, 329). In 1538, at Smithfield, Dr Forest was "hanged in chains by the middle and armholes al quicke and under the galowes was made a fire," Halle, 825.

¹⁰ Elmham, Lib. Metr. 151, 158.

¹¹ Capgr., De Illustr. 122; Foxe, iii. 543.

¹² Strecche, 266 a; cf. Kingsford, Lit. 41.

to fill his place. Six days after his death the mayor of London wrote to the king without mentioning his name, asserting that the capital stood in as great peace and tranquillity as ever did city in the absence of its sovereign lord¹.

The lady Joan was still a prisoner in the Tower when her husband was executed, but she was released a few days afterwards, three knights—John Pelham, Thomas Erpingham, and Simon Felbrigge—giving bonds of 200 marks each that she would come up before the Council within twenty-one days of being summoned². As for the rewards to the captors, parliament had reported on Dec. 17 that the 1000 marks should be paid to Charlton³; but the Welshmen who had personally effected the capture had also to be considered. Their claims were not settled till March, 1421⁴; they were, however, more fortunate than Charlton, who died before receiving payment, and it was not until 1422 that even a portion of the money was paid to his widow⁵.

To the modern mind it is doubtless disheartening to find that the leader of the inevitable struggle so nobly begun on behalf of the emancipation of the human mind should have ended by entangling himself with secular movements of rebellion. This feature of his career proved indeed so disconcerting to his admirers in the sixteenth century that for a long time it was denied that he was ever a rebel or intrigued with his country's enemies. But the facts are now incontestably proved, and if extenuation is required, it must be looked for in the temper of the age. Both sides looked to force to further their opinions, and if it is true that the bishops' remedy was to burn the Lollards, it is no less true that the Lollards' remedy was to kill the bishops. In the eyes of contemporaries, however, his heresy bulked far more largely than his treason, and far worse than his intrigue with the Scots and the puppet "Richard" was his denial of the efficacy of prayer to the Virgin and the saints, of the necessity or value of confession to a priest, and of the

¹ Riley, Mem. 659.

² Claus. 5 Hen. V, 7.

³ Rot. Parl. iv. 111.

⁴ Orig. Lett., Ser. II, i. 87.

⁵ Devon, 370. [Henry Oldcastle, the Lollard's only surviving son, succeeded to part of his father's property in Herefordshire, and probably recovered the manor of Almaly and other possessions in 1431; but it cost him much trouble to establish his claim, and in 1438 some of his father's land in the county was still in the king's hand (Cal. Pat. 1422-29, pp. 546 sqq.; *ibid.* 1429-36, pp. 177 sq.; *ibid.* 1436-41, p. 309; G.E.C. vi. 119). Henry Oldcastle became a man of some account, and represented Herefordshire in the parliaments of 1437, 1442, and 1453 (Return Parl. i. 329, 333, 347).]

change of the substantial bread into the body of God. It was such opinions that gave him a motive for open spiritual revolt, and if in the tumult he attempted to secure his end by insurrection and sedition, the whole course of his career proves that he was no mere ambitious demagogue, but a single-minded enthusiast whose conscience forced him to head the rising movement of religious discontent and whose downright earnestness compelled him to pursue his purpose by every means and at any cost against a persecuting dynasty whose claim to govern England rested upon no better ground than a recent and successful revolution¹.

¹ [Dr Wylie evidently felt strongly on the subject of Oldcastle, and whenever possible I have retained the exact words of those passages of his MS. which treat of Sir John's death, character, and motives. With some of his conclusions and opinions, however, I cannot agree.]

CHAPTER LV

ABORTIVE DIPLOMACY

THE clash of arms had not altogether silenced the voice of diplomacy since Henry had landed at Touques. Communication had very soon been opened with the French court with a view to a possible compromise of the dispute. Henry had written to Charles on Aug. 13, 1417, and Charles had replied from Paris on Aug. 31¹. Formal debates as to the abstract legality of Henry's claim had actually been conducted by heralds on each side up to the eve of the day when Caen was carried by assault²; and while Henry was at Caen, letters had been received from the French king expressing a desire for peace³. On Sept. 24, 1417, the archbishop of Rheims, Gontier Col, Jean de Wailli (President of the *Parlement* of Paris), and four other negotiators were granted safe-conducts to come to some place between Honfleur and Touques⁴, and on Oct. 1 the earl of Warwick and five others were appointed to treat with them⁵. The French envoys received their formal appointment in Paris on Oct. 26, their safe-conduct was renewed on Oct. 27, and by Nov. 10 two of them were in Falaise commanding the garrison there and preparing for the expected English attack⁸. On Nov. 10 safe-conducts were issued for the archbishop of Rheims and one of his fellow-envoys to approach the presence of Henry, together with the two who were organising the defence of Falaise⁹, and yet another safe-conduct was issued for the archbishop on Dec. 23¹⁰. These inconclusive arrangements show that negotiations were never allowed to drop, though we are almost wholly ignorant of what occurred. We know, on the authority of a French contemporary¹¹, that the French envoys were courteously received by the English

¹ Coll. of Arms, Arundel MS. xxix. f. 55; Black, 43.

² Ibid. 37, from Arundel MS. xxvi.

³ Rym. ix. 497, 517.

⁵ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 168, 170.

⁷ Ibid. 505.

⁹ Ibid. 197.

¹¹ Juv. 535.

⁴ Ibid. 494 sq.

⁶ Rym. ix. 498.

⁸ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 197, 312.

¹⁰ Ibid. 222.

king, but that it was found that his conditions were impossible of acceptance. There is, however, a record of one of the meetings which shows that the feeling on both sides was too irritated to make a friendly arrangement at all probable. The parties met on Nov. 28¹ at the manor house of Barneville-le-Bertrand in the woods between Honfleur and Touques². The party were seated on chairs, and the French case was stated by the archbishop of Rheims, who referred to the readiness expressed on both sides to come to terms, but pointed out that he and his colleagues had been kept waiting for at least six weeks at Honfleur, while heralds which they had sent to the English king had been arrested and detained. Against this disregard of the sanctity of safe-conducts he most earnestly protested and begged that the English envoys would do their best to see that the heralds were released. To this Master Philip Morgan politely replied, denying that his side was responsible for the failure of previous negotiations or that the present delay was due to any fault of theirs. On the contrary, he said, the blame rested altogether with the French, who had failed to issue proper safe-conducts. As for the arrest of the heralds, he had no instructions, but there must have been some good reason for their detention. The archbishop replied that he did not want to insist on past grievances. For the failure at Beauvais the year before, Sigismund was responsible. As a guarantee of good faith, the French exhibited their commissions. Here the document breaks off, and what follows is a commission of two years later. We are thus unable to say whether any serious business was transacted at this meeting, but from another source we learn that the Frenchmen left with an assurance that it would not be long before they returned and that the war would soon be at an end³. As a matter of fact, they were back in Paris by Dec. 21, 1417⁴, and soon afterwards visited King Henry during the siege of Falaise, though peace of course was quite beyond hope⁵.

Just before the king sailed in 1417, Bishop Beaufort resigned the chancellorship and received a safe-conduct to enable

¹ Rym. ix. 517, from Cotton MS. Tiberius, E vi. f. 104. No year is specified in the document, but the mention of Walter Hungerford, Thomas Chaucer, John Kemp, and Philip Morgan as the English negotiators seems to fix it as belonging to 1417, as does the presence of the archbishop of Rheims and Gontier Col among the French.

² Vita, 126.

³ Tit. Liv. 45.

⁴ St Denys, vi. 108.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 45; Vita, 126; Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 222.

him to go abroad, asserting that he was about to visit the Holy Land¹. He gave up the great seal to the king in the chapel over the porch of the priory church at Southwick. The king straightway handed it to Thomas Langley, bishop of Durham, who remained chancellor of England for the next seven years². This change has sometimes been spoken of by modern writers as Beaufort's "fall," as though he had for some reason lost favour with Henry, but there seems no reason for any such supposition, for he had just lent the king £14,000³, and the sequel shows that he had merely resigned the great seal to fly at higher game. On leaving England he made his way to the Council of Constance. At Ulm he was met by Bishop Caterick with a special letter of welcome from Sigismund, who had sent two Italian noblemen to attend upon him⁴. When he reached Constance about the beginning of October he was received by the emperor and three of the cardinals⁵. In the dispute then raging as to whether the election of a pope should precede reform, he threw his influence on the side of an immediate election⁶, and little more than a month after his arrival the conclave was held which resulted in the election of Martin V.

The rapidity with which this great step in the direction of official unity, hitherto opposed by Sigismund, followed upon Beaufort's arrival led to the suspicion that there was an understanding between the two that the bishop himself should be the new pope, for Sigismund had made no secret of his determination to have either a German or an Englishman elected⁷. But the strength of the French element in the college precluded any chance of his election, and the English threw their weight on the side of Cardinal Colonna, who was eventually chosen⁸. Beaufort was offered consolation by Martin V in the shape of a cardinal's hat with the office of legate in Wales and Ireland; but moved by Archbishop Chichele's remonstrances⁹, the king forbade him to accept either offer; and he did not become a

¹ Rym. ix. 472; D.K.R. xliv. 599; Wals. ii. 319.

² Rym. x. 340.

³ Rot. Parl. iv. 132.

⁴ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 236; Lenfant (trans.), ii. 143; [Finke, Acta, ii. 147].

⁵ [Fillastre's journal shows that he arrived between Sept. 27 and Oct. 9, Finke, Acta, ii. 147.]

⁶ Lenfant, ii. 442; Otterbourne, 279; Walsingham, ii. 319; Angl. Sacr. i. 800. [According to Fillastre, however, the English representatives, acting under instructions from Henry, had inclined towards this policy before Beaufort's arrival, Finke, Acta, ii. 139.]

⁷ Finke, Forsch. 227, Acta, ii. 148; St Denys, vi. 58.

⁸ [Finke, Acta, ii. 158.]

⁹ Duck, Vita Chich. 78 sq.; Stevenson, Wars, ii. pt. 2, 441.

cardinal till 1426. Beaufort himself refused a request that he would take over the custody of the deposed John XXIII¹; and when winter drew towards its end, he set out for Venice, astonishing many people who had thought his pilgrimage a mere pretext². Accompanied by Abbot Spofford of St Mary's, York, and sixty mounted attendants, he arrived in the city on March 18, 1418³. He was honourably welcomed by the Doge and entertained with great respect, as was fitting in the case of a man with an income of 100,000 gold ducats⁴. His journey to Jerusalem, however, was marked by no pomp, for his personal suite consisted of but eight persons when he set sail from Venice on April 10, accompanied by fifteen or sixteen pilgrims, all of whose expenses he paid. He had given special orders that no word should be forwarded about his journey, so that he might be quite unexpected on his arrival; and in fact, but for the Venetian records, we should know virtually nothing about the pilgrimage and might have been tempted to regard the English safe-conduct as nothing but a blind⁵. Five months later Beaufort returned in a Rhodes galley, landing at Venice on Sept. 10⁶. On his way home he seems to have halted at Mantua for another interview with Pope Martin V. There he took up in his train one of the most notable Italians of the Renaissance, Gian Francesco Poggio Bracciolini, who accompanied Beaufort in the hope of bettering his prospects⁷.

One of the first efforts of the new pope Martin V was directed towards the reconciliation of France and England. He despatched two of the leading cardinals—Orsini and Fillastre—whose first instructions were issued at Constance on March 18, 1418⁸. They did not, however, leave Constance till April 2⁹; and in the meanwhile Sigismund had remonstrated so strongly against his omission from the terms of pacification that supplementary instructions, dated April 3, were drawn up¹⁰. By April 24 the two cardinals had reached Troyes, then the headquarters of the government of Queen Isabel and the duke of Burgundy. Here they prepared to take part in the negotiations

¹ Rym. ix. 540.

² Cal. Pap. Lett. vii. 6; [Finke, Acta, ii. 148].

³ Morosini, ii. 158.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ For a reference to his journey to Jerusalem, see Otterbourne, 279.

⁶ Morosini, ii. 164; Sanuto, 923.

⁷ Morosini, ii. 166 n.; Shepherd, 111 sq.; Walser, 71.

⁸ Rym. ix. 558 sqq.; Cal. Pap. Lett. vii. 7.

⁹ [Finke, Acta, ii. 168.]

¹⁰ Rym. ix. 569.

with the Paris government that were proceeding at La Tombe, and at the same time they wrote to King Henry requesting that, owing to the insecurity of the roads, separate safe-conducts might be made out for one hundred attendants with each of them¹. The safe-conduct for Cardinal Orsini was issued on May 14², ten days before Henry left Caen for his summer campaign. But before setting out for Normandy Orsini went to Paris, and it was not until the middle of June that he set out thence to visit Henry at Louviers, where he arrived on June 24, just as the siege was over³. He was honourably received and given a respectful hearing, though after what had lately happened in Paris Henry was more than ever convinced that he had been chosen by God to chastise the sinful French⁴. Orsini was soon joined by Fillastre⁵, and negotiations were still proceeding on July 21⁶. In the end, however, the cardinals found the task of peace-making quite beyond their powers. They had to content themselves with minor successes—such as obtaining favour for Jean Langret, bishop of Bayeux, who was then at Constance and had indicated his readiness to do homage to Henry⁷, and for Nicolas de Clémanges, cantor of the cathedral, famous for his denunciations of the corruption of the Church⁸.

In the meantime there had been sensational happenings among the French. After several meetings at La Tombe the claims of each party were set forth in a couple of state papers dated April 25, 1418⁹. These made it evident that there was no basis of agreement; and neither side in its reply did anything to improve the situation. About this time there arrived cardinals Orsini and Fillastre, who conferred with the representatives of both parties¹⁰. Cardinal Fillastre then went forward to Paris with the archbishop of Rheims to explain the purpose of his mission to the king¹¹, his exhortations being sympathetically heard by the Council, which

¹ Rym. ix. 578. ² Ibid. 588. ³ St Denys, vi. 250; Tit. Liv. 58; Goodwin, 178.

⁴ Vita, 170; St Denys, vi. 250. See below, pp. 102 sqq.

⁵ D.K.R. xli. 693.

⁶ Delpit, 222; Gesta, 123.

⁷ Rym. ix. 567. The bishop seems never to have presented himself before Henry, but died at Paris in July, 1419 (Gams, 507; Eubel, i. 127).

⁸ Rym. ix. 577; D.K.R. xli. 692; Béziers, Hist. App. 17, Mem. i. 380; Puiseux, Emigr. 29.

⁹ St Denys, vi. 208–226; Beaucourt, i. 80–85.

¹⁰ Belleforest, Chron. 323 a; Monstr. iii. 256; Juv. 540.

¹¹ Cordeliers, 252; Monstr. iii. 256; Douët d'Arcq, i. 397; [Bibl. Éc. Chartes, xlix. 435; Valois, iv. 431 sq.].

of course gave him to understand that the obstacle to peace was the duke of Burgundy. He soon rejoined his colleague at Montereau, and the two assiduously attended the discussions of the hostile factions. How it happened is not clear, but within a few days the two sides had entered into a provisional agreement¹, which was duly signed by the envoys, who thereupon departed to secure its ratification by their respective chiefs. Naturally the duke of Burgundy was quite content² and the population of Paris received the king's envoys with great rejoicing³. But the count of Armagnac refused to look at the agreement, and when the bishop of Paris got a council called together by the dauphin, he refused to attend⁴. Nevertheless a three weeks' truce was officially announced in Paris on May 27⁵, and this, together with the fact that a compromise should have been seriously considered at all, shows that a great rift had been made in the power of the count of Armagnac, who no longer had the city in his grasp. A few weeks before he had returned discredited from a vain attempt to reduce one of the smallest fortified towns in the neighbourhood⁶, which defied him even after a two months' siege. Meanwhile, Paris was full of disease, food had risen to famine prices, robbery and violence were rife, and fiendish cruelties were perpetrated in the streets. Yet with all this misery and discontent prevailing, the constable relaxed nothing of his severity, forcing his will upon the Parisians as though they were slaves. He seized the stuff of the workmen's looms for tents and pavilions⁷, and when the workmen clamoured for their pay, told them in his brutal Gascon that they ought to have a penny to buy a halter⁸. Sooner than entertain the thought of peace with Burgundy he would sell Paris to the English⁹.

The announcement of a mere truce instead of the expected peace seems to have been the last straw. Nine desperate men, two of them priests, sent a secret message to the Burgundians, assuring them that once they could get a foothold in the city

¹ "Tomberent en un appointment," Paradin, 624; "tombent d'accord," Vandembroeck, 133; St Denys, vi. 228; Juv. 540.

² Cordeliers, 253.

³ St Denys, vi. 228; Boulay, v. 331.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 257; Denifle, Chart. iv. 346.

⁵ Félibien, ii. 786, 792; Juv. 540.

⁶ i.e. Senlis. Cordeliers, 248-251; Flammermont, 206, 278; St Denys, vi. 198; Bourgeois, 85 sq.; Paradin, 626; Félibien, iv. 566.

⁷ Bourgeois, 86.

⁸ Ibid. 92 sq.

⁹ Ibid. 87, 97.

all danger would be over, for all Paris would be with them and many of the Armagnacs were absent in the field against the English¹. Early in the morning of Sunday, May 29, 600 or 700 horsemen from Pontoise, under Jean de Villiers, lord of L'Isle Adam, were clandestinely admitted at the Porte St Germain². They were soon joined by 400 well-armed townsmen, who were in readiness. These raised the shout, "Our Lady and the peace!" the partisans of Burgundy poured from the houses, and the streets were soon thronged with thousands of men armed with any old weapon or tool that came to hand³, wearing the St Andrew's cross of the duke of Burgundy⁴, and shouting, "Long live the king, the dauphin and the peace⁵!" The houses of Armagnacs were plundered, and their occupants seized and murdered in the streets or flung into the prisons. The constable escaped in disguise to the cottage of a bricklayer⁶, who however gave him up, and he was taken to the Little Châtelet⁷ and afterwards lodged in the Round Tower of the Palace⁸. The king, who was sunk in inertia, was treated by the lord of L'Isle Adam and his associates with profound respect; for his part he received them graciously⁹ and on the day after their entry suffered himself to be taken by them through the streets amid the cheers of the populace¹⁰. When the alarm was given, Tanneguy du Chastel, the *prévôt* of Paris, managed to rush the dauphin to the Bastille of St Antoine¹¹, whence he was conveyed to a place of safety at Melun¹².

Fifty Armagnacs in the Bastille kept up a lively fire on the Burgundians and held them at bay until, three days later, an Armagnac force, 1400 strong, entered the city from St Denis¹³

¹ Longnon, 34; Bourgeois, 87 sq.; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 37; Raoulet, 160.

² Félibien, iv. 566, 569; Mart. Anec. ii. 1950; Monstr. iii. 260 sq.; Juv. 540; Cousinot, 169; St Denys, vi. 230; Norm. Chron. 184; Vallet de Viriville, Instruction, 362; Denifle, Auctarium, ii. 244; Anselme, vii. 10; Longnon, 21; Beaucourt, i. 86, 99.

³ St Denys, vi. 232.

⁴ Félibien, iv. 567; Gabriel Daniel, iii. 892, 894.

⁵ Bourgeois, 89. "Vive le roi et le duc de Bourgogne; que ceux qui veulent la paix se joignent à nous" (St Denys, vi. 232). Cf. Monstr. iii. 262; Juv. 540.

⁶ St Denys, vi. 234; Juv. 540.

⁷ Félibien, iv. 567; Bourgeois, 92, n. 1.

⁸ On June 6, Barante, iii. 235, 240; Félibien, iv. 569.

⁹ Cordeliers, 255; Bouvier, 435; Norm. Chron. 184; St Denys, vi. 232.

¹⁰ Ordonnances, x. 477; Le Fèvre, 329; Félibien, iv. 566, 568; Barante, iii. 235, 237.

¹¹ Raoulet, 161; Cordeliers, 260; Monstr. iii. 262; Le Fèvre, i. 328; St Denys, vi. 232; Pastoralet, 802; Barante, iii. 233; Beaucourt, i. 99.

¹² Fenin, 269; Garnier, Documents, 48; Juv. 540; St Denys, vi. 234; Monstr. iii. 264.

¹³ Félibien, iv. 567; Longnon, 22; Garnier, 49; Beaucourt, i. 91.

and at first made some progress, slaughtering and plundering without mercy as they advanced with shouts of "Long live the king, the dauphin, and the king of England! Slay all! Slay all!" But within the last days the Paris mob had been properly armed, and now, headed by the new *prévôt* Guy de Bar, the town troops met the intruders and drove them slowly back in bloody fighting². Seeing the failure of the enterprise, the Armagnacs three days later evacuated the Bastille³, and henceforth the Burgundians had Paris firmly in their grasp.

The populace, however, remained liable to panic—a state of mind which led to ghastly consequences. In the evening of Sunday, June 12, an alarm was raised that the Armagnacs were getting in, and crowds gathered at the gates shouting, "Nous sommes trahis!" Finding no trace of any enemy, they headed frantically for the *Maison de Ville* on the Place de Grève. Then arose a cry, "Slay, slay the Armagnac dogs!" and there was a general rush for the prisons. The Armagnacs detained at the Louvre escaped because the king was living there under direct Burgundian protection; but at all the other prisons they were mercilessly butchered, and their bodies flung into the streets to be mutilated and stripped. Among the victims were four bishops⁴, two presidents of the *Parlement*, and many doctors of medicine and theology from the university. But the most notable of those who perished was the count of Armagnac, whose naked corpse lay for three days in the court-yard of the Palace, subject to all manner of savage indignities⁵. The number of persons killed in that terrible night was very variously estimated; but one is not likely to be far wrong in accepting the figure of 1518 given by a chronicler who was present in the city and entered particulars of current events in a journal day by day⁶.

¹ Bourgeois, 90. Monstr. (iii. 265) substitutes "le connestable d'Armagnac" for the king of England, but on this point the "Bourgeois" is the better authority.

² Norm. Chron. 185; St Denys, vi. 236; Cousinot, 171; Gaguin, cxiii; Félibien, iv. 567, 572, 576.

³ Monstr. iii. 266.

⁴ Guillaume de Cantiers, of Évreux (Gall. Christ. xi. 601; Gams, 550; Eubel, i. 244, 283), Jean d'Achery, of Senlis (Gall. Christ. x. 1432; Gams, 628; Juv. 541; Cousinot, 170), Pierre Fresnel, of Lisieux (Norm. Chron. 186; Gall. Christ. xi. 791; Gams, 566; Eubel, i. 317) and Jean de Marle, of Coutances (Gall. Christ. xi. 890; Eubel, i. 213).

⁵ Ordonnances, x. 478; Pastoralet, 807, 810; Norm. Chron. (Williams) 186, (Hellot) 38; G. Paradin, 630; Cordeliers, 259; Cagny, 113; Monstr. iii. 271; Le Fèvre, i. 332; Juv. 541; Raoulet, 162.

⁶ Bourgeois, 98.

Then began a month of gloom and terror. All the city gates but two were barred, and trade was almost at a standstill. Everyone longed for the arrival of the duke of Burgundy, which alone could restore order and confidence. His counsellors indeed had long been urging him to quit all other business and hasten to Paris¹; but he showed little concern at what was passing, returned from Montbéliard by easy stages, spending some time hunting and merry-making at Dijon² and staying for nearly a fortnight at Troyes³. At length, on July 14, he entered Paris with great pomp and ceremony, accompanied by the queen and the prince of Orange, amid the tumultuous jubilation of the people⁴. The poor king received them kindly, as he did everybody, and even thanked the duke for the kindness he had shown to the queen⁵. The duke for his part at once took steps to make the most of his precarious tenure of power, securing money for the payment of his troops⁶ and filling all offices, to the very humblest, with his nominees⁷. But he did nothing in restraint of the Paris mob: indeed his conduct in this relation lends colour to the charge that his delay in arriving had been prompted by the hope that the Parisians would lighten his task by making short work of the Armagnacs while he could still deny responsibility for what happened⁸. However that may be, the duke's arrival was followed by the arrest of numerous alleged Armagnacs, and the prisons were again full when on Aug. 20 there occurred another terrible outburst of Parisian brutality; and for the whole of a night and part of a day the butchery went on till at least 3500 victims had perished. The murderers met with no opposition, except at the Châtelet, where the prisoners sold their lives dearly, and at the Bastille, where the duke of Burgundy himself pleaded in vain for some restraint⁹.

¹ Garnier, 50; Chastellux, 83.

² Itin. 440; Gachard, 239.

³ Itin. 442.

⁴ Itin. 443; Bourgeois, 104; St Denys, vi. 252; Le Fèvre, i. 332; Cordeliers, 260; Monstr. iii. 272 sq.; Juv. 542. A member of the duke's suite wrote an account of the pageant two days later. It has been published more than once—e.g. by A. Longnon in the *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris*, i. (1874), 104–109.

⁵ Fenin, 94, 95; Longnon, 107.

⁶ Plancher, iii. 494, 495, cccix.

⁷ Ordonnances, x. 459, 463; Cordeliers, 261; Fenin, 94 sq.; St Denys, vi. 260; Norm. Chron. 186.

⁸ Cousinot, 173.

⁹ Félibien, iv. 569, 570; St Denys, vi. 248, 262; Bourgeois, 107 sqq.; Le Fèvre, i. 338; Juv. 543; Norm. Chron. 186; Denifle, Auct. ii. 252; Cousinot, 171, 173.

It was perhaps this episode which determined the duke to make a serious effort to secure peace. The Armagnacs, in any case, were powerful; they had recovered to some extent from the debacle of June; they held the person of the dauphin; Tanneguy du Chastel had assumed the leadership; and they had become aggressive and gained some minor successes in the Loire valley¹. Here the duke of Brittany, acting in the interests of the dukes of Alençon and Anjou as well as his own, had been trying to mediate between the two factions²; and it was while he was engaged in these efforts that on Aug. 24 he received from Paris an invitation to go there and lend his services to the cause of a general reconciliation. Fearing to enter Paris itself because of the pestilence raging in the city, he took up his quarters at St Maur-des-Fossés, where, after conferences between him and the duke of Burgundy, "a kind of treaty"³ was arranged on Sept. 16, whereby the past was to be forgotten, and Duke John and the dauphin were to join hands against the common enemy. The terms of the agreement were read in the *Parlement*⁴, the king signified his assent, and the Parisians again lit bonfires⁵. But when the schedule was presented to the dauphin for his ratification, it appeared that he had become intractable. The duke of Brittany, he said, had overstepped his powers, and he vowed that he would have no terms but the punishment of the murderer who had killed his uncle and multitudes of his loyal subjects⁶. He followed this up on Sept. 21 by a violent manifesto, in which he denounced the duke of Burgundy for approving of the Paris massacres, and set up a *Parlement* of his own at Poitiers⁷. Civil peace in France was more remote than ever.

¹ Juv. 544; Delaville le Roulx, 179, 186; D. Sauvage, II, lxxi; Belleforest, Chron. 325.

² Delaville le Roulx, 170, 186-188.

³ "Une paix telle quelle," Bourgeois, 114; "une espece de traité," Gabriel Daniel, iii. 894; cf. Ordonnances, x. 473, 476; Itin. 443; Plancher, iii. 500; Juv. 544.

⁴ Bourgeois, 114, n. 5; Félibien, iv. 571. For the text see St Denys, vi. 278 sqq.

⁵ Ibid. 282; Juv. 544; Fenin, 273.

⁶ Ibid. 272 sq.; Delaville le Roulx, 193; Cagny, 115.

⁷ Ordonnances, x. 477; Félibien, ii. 793; Cousinot, 151, 172; Gabriel Daniel, iii. 895; Neuville, 4, 6.

CHAPTER LVI

THE CONQUEST OF LOWER NORMANDY COMPLETED

DESPITE some activity on the part of a bastard son of the late duke of Alençon, who recaptured Fresnay-le-Vicomte, Beaumont-le-Vicomte, and about a dozen other strongholds on the northern confines of Maine¹, only three fortresses held out in western Normandy when Henry left Caen for his summer campaign. These were Domfront, Cherbourg, and Mont-St-Michel. Though there was little hope of their being relieved, they could render great service to their country by detaining English forces before their walls. Mont-St-Michel, however, was never seriously attacked by Henry V, and need hardly be taken into account as a factor in the contest. Domfront, on the other hand, could not be ignored. The castle, perched high on a rock, defied mines, missiles, and ladders, and the earl of Warwick, who was entrusted with the operations, resolved to reduce it by hunger². The blockade began early in April, but the process was a tedious one, for the besiegers were kept on the alert by frequent attacks from the garrison, while their supplies were exposed to raids by bands of desperadoes who lurked in the woods under the leadership of the Bastard of Alençon³. Time, however, was on the side of the English. By June 29 the town had fallen into their hands⁴, and on July 10 the castle agreed to surrender if no effective help should arrive within twelve days; and at the end of that time, the garrison marched out quietly with their arms and harness, leaving behind their cannon and bombards⁵.

Meanwhile, another force, under the duke of Gloucester, had been occupied with the strong fortress of Cherbourg. The

¹ Juv. 540. Fresnay and Beaumont were taken between May 12 and Aug. 4 (D.K.R. xli. 710; Triger, Beaumont, 31, n. 1).

² Norm. Chron. (Williams) 183, 190, (Hellot) 35, 45; Caillebotte, 19; Tit. Liv. 51; Vita, 144 sqq. On March 30, 1418, the earl of Warwick was ordered to seize all castles, etc., "quae contra regem manu forti tenentur" (Bréquigny, 210). For a nearly contemporary picture of the siege of Domfront by the earl of Warwick, see Strutt, Manners, ii. 126, Plate XLIII; Kingsford, 224.

³ Vita, 145; Juv. 540.

⁴ A. Collins, viii. 107.

⁵ Rym. ix. 601; Tit. Liv. 51; Vita, 146.

town of Cherbourg stands on a low sandy flat at the foot of steep hills, where the little river Divette empties itself into the sea. It had long been defended on its northern side by a castle which Froissart classed as among the strongest in the world¹. The castle, which lay altogether within the town walls, contained accommodation for 1000 men and storage for supplies sufficient for a long siege². The town walls, which had not been completed till the middle of the fourteenth century, were from five to six feet in thickness. At every tide the sea came up to the walls, and at high floods the town was almost surrounded by water owing to the deep ditches, cut in the underlying rock, which hemmed it in on the south³. It is no wonder that the place was thought impregnable⁴, and when after its capture a proposal was made to strengthen it further, the English captain argued that nothing need be done, as it was stronger than Caen, Rouen, or any other place captured by the English⁵.

After sending forward some knights to report on the prospects of success, the duke of Gloucester proceeded to plan his attack. The east side of the town was inaccessible, the bridge across the harbour having been destroyed at the first warning of the approach of the English⁶. The main portion of the army was therefore encamped on the flat land to the west. Here the chief difficulty arose from the constant shifting of the hummocks of loose sand. The suburbs had been burned, but every building that remained was eagerly turned into quarters for the leaders. The main body of the force, however, was exposed to the full fury of the town guns as it lay on the wind-swept and

¹ Froiss. ii. 41.

² The castle was completely demolished by Vauban, who, however, at one time thought of preserving it and so had careful drawings made. These are still to be seen at the *Mairie*. They show that it had a strong keep and four large towers and that it occupied the ground lying between the *Quai du Port*, the *Place Briqueville*, the *Rue Quai du Bassin*, the *Rue du Château*, and the *Rue Notre Dame* (*Ménant*, 6, 16, 18; *Gerville*, 197; *Voisin la Hougue*, 63; *Amiot*, 126; *Vita*, 162).

³ *Fleury-Vallée*, 23, 54, 62, 64; *Ménant*, 5, 15; *Voisin la Hougue*, 81; *Gerville*, 212. The walls and ditches have disappeared, and the course of the river has been diverted, but the plan of the defences has been clearly made out by the industry of local antiquaries.

⁴ *Tit. Liv.* 52; *Blondel*, *Reductio*, 232, 236; *Pontaumont*, *Documents*, 363; *Voisin la Hougue*, 69; *Gerville*, 206. Since the completion of the walls the place had been twice besieged, but though it had been pledged to the English by the king of Navarre in 1378 and held by them for fifteen years, it had never yet yielded to force (*Voisin la Hougue*, 66; *Amiot*, 165; *Gerville*, 205; *Coville-Lavisse*, IV. i. 248; *Blondel*, 257, 438, 439; *Ann. Ric.* II, 164; *Wals.* ii. 214).

⁵ *Vita*, 149.

⁶ *Tit. Liv.* 52, 54; *Vita*, 148; *First Life*, 109; *Ménant*, 19, 71.

ever shifting sand¹. The English, working by night in groups of three, gathered stones and brushwood from the hillsides to the south, and each gang brought down its sledge-load and floated it to the front by cross-cuts dug among the water-courses, hoping thus to form a shelter against the hail of stones². But as fast as the wattle was erected, the besieged set it on fire with balls of flaming tow shot from their engines³ or tore it up by means of barbed claws flung out from the walls⁴. Despairing of a rapid success, the duke of Gloucester then resolved to starve the garrison into submission⁵. He therefore fortified his lines strongly with towers and ditches⁶, built huts for his men out of range of the guns, laid down great stores of provisions, and brought up a fleet of ships from Jersey and Guernsey to block the sea front and stop the entrance of supplies. He gathered delvers from the countryside to turn the course of the river, but the spring-tides broke through at the new moon⁷, and all the labour was in vain. Spades, ploughs and harrows were pressed into service, and the soil was thrown up into enormous mounds which overtopped the walls, and up these the attackers swarmed only to find that their tortoises were no match for the stones rained on them from the engines on the battlements. In one place the English sows rooted underground and made a royal mine, which caused the defenders much alarm, bringing on a fight in which, according to the English account, they had the worse of it; but in the end the miners were baffled by the rock and unstable sand⁸. A vulnerable part of the walls was found on the northern front, but it was not possible to bring the guns to bear upon it⁹. The earl of March had pushed an engine close to the walls and covered it with a bulwark. On Midsummer Day the French made a determined sally, burnt the bulwark, and damaged the engine badly; but they failed to break through the blockading line, and the harm they did was

¹ Tit. Liv. 52.

² Ibid. 53; First Life, 111; Duchesne, Antiq. ii. 406.

³ Tit. Liv. 53.

⁴ Vita, 156.

⁵ Ibid. 153; Tit. Liv. 53.

⁶ Ibid. 53, 55.

⁷ Ibid. 54.

⁸ A. Collins, viii. 107; Blondel, Reductio, 234.

⁹ Ibid. 232 sqq.; Duchesne, Antiq. ii. 406. The later story (Voisin la Hougue, 81) that the English dragged guns into position against the weak point when the tide ebbed and removed them when the sea returned is supported by no contemporary evidence and is probably due to confusion of this siege with that of 1450, when the place was retaken by the French.

speedily repaired¹. The besieged sent messages of ever increasing urgency to the court at Paris by means of runners who swam the estuary at its mouth²; but when no help was sent and food began to fail, the garrison showed signs of disaffection. Nevertheless, the first overtures for a capitulation proved fruitless, as the spirit of resistance was as yet by no means broken. One day, however, a fleet of thirty vessels was seen in the offing. For a moment the hopes of the French rose high with the thought that help had come at last; but when the ships drew nearer they discovered that they were really bringing strong reinforcements from England to help in the reduction of the town. Then at length they yielded to despair: and on Aug. 22³ an appointment was drafted whereby the earl of March, John Lord Clifford, Walter Hungerford, Gerard Usflete, John Robsart, and William Beauchamp, acting on behalf of the duke of Gloucester, entered into an agreement with the garrison that they should have till Michaelmas to apply for help to the French king, but if no relief arrived by that date, they should surrender⁴. The English used the interval to make preparations to beat off any relieving force that might appear. None, however, attempted a rescue; and so when Michaelmas came Cherbourg made an honourable surrender after five months of heroic isolation. It is usual to speak of this surrender as an act of treachery, and among the French it became a tradition that an officer of the garrison, Jean d'Angennes, accepted money from the English⁵. It is certain that when he left the place, he had a safe-conduct to go where he pleased and that he went to Rouen, where he was subsequently beheaded by order of King Henry⁶. During the siege the English had lost heavily, but the loss was repaid by the value of the capture, which moreover released 3000 seasoned troops to help forward the attack on Rouen⁷.

Like most other Norman towns Cherbourg did not take long to accommodate itself to the new situation. Within a few weeks of the surrender the great abbey of Our Lady of the Vow, built

¹ A. Collins, viii. 107.

² Vita, 157.

³ Rym. ix. 618; Bréquigny, 34.

⁴ Tit. Liv. 56; Vita, 162.

⁵ Monstr. iii. 242 sq.; Waurin, ii. 244; Voisin la Hougue, 75. He is commonly styled the commander, but erroneously (Rym. ix. 618).

⁶ Chérueil, 66.

⁷ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 191, (Hellot) 46.

by the Empress Matilda in fulfilment of a vow made by William the Conqueror, received back its possessions¹. Immigrants flocked in from all parts of England and Ireland²; houses and tenements were freely granted to the new-comers³; the names of the streets were altered⁴; the church of the Trinity, which still stands on the sea front, was completed⁵; the castle was repaired and garrisoned with 40 men-at-arms and 120 archers⁶; and in 1419 Cherbourg was made the chief town of its *vicomté* instead of Valognes⁷. It was one of the last places to be recovered by the French.

In the meantime great progress was being made with the main campaign to the east. At the end of February Clarence had been placed in command of the troops on the eastern confines of the territory in English occupation⁸: the government of the *vicomtés* of Auge, Orbec, and Pont-Audemer had been entrusted to him, subject to the authority of the *bailli* and the Norman *Échiquier*⁹: and, saving to Henry the homage and military service of the feudal tenants, the right of taxation, and the control of woods and forests, he had been granted the lordship of the royal demesne in these *vicomtés* and that of Pont-Aouthou¹⁰. Early in March he consolidated the English hold of the valley of the Touques by the capture of Courtonne¹¹, Chambröis¹², and Faugnernon¹³, and by the surrender of La Rivière de Thibouville on March 14 he secured a passage across the Risle¹⁴. On April 9, after a fifteen days' siege, he reduced the strong castle of Harcourt, where he found an exceptionally rich treasure of money, jewels, and other valuables¹⁵. But he met with an unusually defiant resistance at the great Benedictine abbey of Bec, which was held by a garrison of desperate Frenchmen. They had stripped the neighbouring region bare, so that great numbers of homeless people took refuge in the fortified enclosure of the abbey, bringing with them their cattle and whatever food they could carry¹⁶. The

¹ Rym. ix. 653.

² Luce, i. 296.

³ Bréquigny, 108, 117, 128.

⁴ e.g. Humphrey street, named from the duke of Gloucester in 1420 (*ibid.* 150).

⁵ The choir, the chapels, and the tower were finished about 1423.

⁶ Luce, i. 297.

⁷ Delisle, Baillis, 9; Bréquigny, 91.

⁸ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 254.

⁹ *Ibid.* 259 sq.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 317 sqq.

¹¹ *Ibid.* 303; Tit. Liv. 49.

¹² Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 294 sq.; Tit. Liv. 49. The place is now called Broglie.

¹³ *Ibid.*; Vita, 140.

¹⁴ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 292.

¹⁵ Bréquigny, 7 (where the capitulation is misdated); Porée, ii. 176; Verneuil, 220.

¹⁶ Bec Chron. 82, 87.

abbey was enclosed by a strong wall, and the monks had to watch with dismay the demolition by the garrison of their outlying buildings, including the old chapel of their saintly founder Herlouin. The recently appointed abbot, Robert de Valée, remained at Paris or Pontoise during the siege¹. The hope of the defenders lay in the dauphin, who as usual did nothing. They nevertheless held out manfully for some time; but after the fall of Harcourt, the duke of Clarence brought up the whole of his force and assailed them day and night². About three weeks later they lost heart, and after setting fire to most of the abbey buildings³, they opened negotiations which led to their surrender on May 4, the garrison being permitted to go away with nothing but the clothes they stood in⁴. The wretched monks had been grievously pillaged by the defenders, they had nothing but the grist of their mills on which to support themselves and their servants, and even when they had sent to all their distant granges⁵, they could not raise half enough to satisfy the English demands, the victors being particularly stern in their treatment of the monks, doubtless because the new abbot showed no sign of submission⁶. On June 19 custody of the abbey's temporalities was restored to them; but all the profits had still to go to the king, and the monastery was occupied by an English garrison of twenty men-at-arms and sixty archers⁷.

The fate of Bec apparently had its effect on the defenders of Évreux, the next place to be besieged, since it capitulated to the duke of Exeter on May 20, only four days after he had been commissioned to reduce it⁸.

In consequence of the operations of the duke of Clarence, the first stages of the king's eastward progress were peaceful. He was at Lisieux by May 27⁹; on June 2 and 3 he was at Bernay¹⁰, where he appointed the earl of March his lieutenant

¹ Bec Chron. 85, 86, 225; Porée, ii. 176.

² Norm. Chron. (Williams) 182, (Hellot) 34; Bec Chron. 86.

³ Ibid. 83; Porée, ii. 174.

⁴ Bec Chron. 86, 87, 226; Porée, ii. 177, 179; Monstier, 470; Bréquigny, 19.

⁵ Bec Chron. 88.

⁶ He did not take the oath of fealty till Feb. 12, 1419 (Gall. Christ. xi. 236; Monstier, 471).

⁷ Rym. ix. 598.

⁸ Ibid. 589; Bréquigny, 24; Otterbourne, 281; Wals. ii. 329; Norm. Chron. 192.

⁹ Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 1364/56.

¹⁰ Ibid. 57-59.

and general warden for all Normandy¹. He then visited Bec² and Le Neubourg³, and by June 8 had reached Louviers⁴.

On the same day the king issued orders that musters of all available forces were to be held as soon as possible⁵. To what extent the numbers of his troops had increased since the landing at Touques can only be guessed. We know, indeed, that large reinforcements, numbering at least 500 men-at-arms and 1500 archers, had been sent from England under the duke of Exeter⁶; but though many writs are extant⁷ showing the names of the officials responsible for the inspection now ordered and the captains whose forces came under review, there is no record of the numbers returned.

Louviers had only recently been fortified⁸, but the duke of Clarence described it as a very strong town⁹, and it justified his words by holding out for the better part of three weeks. During the siege the king had a narrow escape from a stone shot that passed close to him and smashed the pole of his tent as he was talking with the earl of Salisbury at the door. It remains a dark blot on his fame that when the siege was over he hanged eight of the gunners, a ninth being spared only at the intercession of Cardinal Orsini, and even then being condemned to imprisonment for life¹⁰. The feeling of the townspeople was strongly

¹ Rym. ix. 592.

² Chanc. Warr., Ser. 1, 1364/59, 60; Bréquigny, 29, 213; Bec Chron. 87; Porée, ii. 177; Gesta, 126.

³ Bréquigny, 29.

⁴ Chanc. Warr., Ser. 1, 1364/61.

⁵ Rym. ix. 595; Vita, 166.

⁶ Tit. Liv. 56; Vita, 164; Wals. ii. 328. One estimate gives their numbers as 15,000, an absurd figure, but an indication that the force was really a big one. We know that great care had been taken to keep open communication between England and Normandy. Early in February a force of 361 men-at-arms and 672 archers was told off to safeguard the sea under the duke of Exeter or John Arundel his deputy (Iss. Roll 5 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 14, 1418, March 1, 1418, March 5, 1418; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 148; Devon, 355), while there is evidence that another squadron, consisting of four barges and four balingers, was at sea for the same purpose, under Richard Lord Scrope of Bolton (*ibid.*). About the middle of April the regent ordered that musters should be held of various contingents about to cross to France (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 201). They belonged to Henry Lord Fitzhugh (80 men-at-arms, 240 archers), Gilbert Umfraville (60 and 180), Edward Holland, count of Mortain (40 and 120), the duke of Exeter (260 and 780), and the duke of Clarence (60 and 180). All were retained for one year. The payment of a quarter's wages to them is recorded in Iss. Roll 6 Hen. V, Pasch., June 1, 1418. On May 9 the same roll records payment of wages for the shipment of the duke of Exeter and other lords going to Normandy with their retinues.

⁷ Rym. ix. 595.

⁸ Morin, i. 103, 116, 125.

⁹ In a letter dated July 5 (Delpit, 22).

¹⁰ Tit. Liv. 58; Vita, 169; Strecche, 271; Kingsford, Lit. 41.

Burgundian¹, and this doubtless curtailed resistance. By June 20 the English were in possession of the town, where the king stayed a few days, appointing officers to administer and defend it², and arranging for the payment of a fine of 8000 crowns, in return for which the inhabitants would be allowed to retain their possessions³.

Little time, however, was wasted, and by June 27⁴ the army was before Pont de l'Arche, at the confluence of the Seine and the Eure. Here orders were given for further musters to be held by July 23⁵. The king took up his quarters at the Cistercian abbey of Bonport⁶, founded by Richard the Lion-Heart. The abbot at once made his submission, and was accorded the king's protection⁷.

The town of Pont de l'Arche, encircled with its walls and ditches, formed a strong fortress at the southern end of the famous bridge⁸ that had long been the only passage of the Seine for miles around. On a small island close to the bridge-head on the opposite bank stood a square fort built in very early days to protect the passage from attack from the north⁹. The task before the English was thus a new and formidable one. To their right was the fortified town of Pont de l'Arche, backed by the river Eure about half a mile away, and in front of them the wide deep Seine flowing swiftly amidst grassy islands, while thousands of enemies, with perfect freedom of movement, awaited them on the further shore¹⁰. Nothing, however, could daunt the resolution of the English, and during the first fortnight in July the town was subjected to a series of vigorous assaults¹¹. These all failed, and the besiegers now saw that if success was to be achieved, they would have to secure both banks of the river. The exploit of crossing the Seine seems for some reason to have made a great impression

¹ Norm. Chron. 183.

² e.g. William Pailleux was appointed *bailli* of Louviers on July 12 (Bréquigny, 32, 37).

³ *Ibid.* 31.

⁴ Wals. ii. 329; Vita, 170; Gesta, 123.

⁵ Rym. ix. 595.

⁶ Bréquigny, 31; Cochon, 279; Monstr. iii. 275; Tit. Liv. 58; Vita, 172.

⁷ Bréquigny, 208; Gall. Christ. xi. 668.

⁸ Built in the thirteenth or fourteenth century in place of the old one which dated from the time of Charles the Bald.

⁹ Tit. Liv. 58; Vita, 171; Nagerel, 10; Duranville, Pont de l'Arche, i. 9.

¹⁰ Delpit, 222; Cochon, 279; Monstr. iii. 276.

¹¹ Norm. Chron. 187.

on the mind of the English, and soon gave rise to picturesque stories from which it is difficult to disentangle what really happened. According to one of these accounts, the besiegers were pestered by shouting bands of Frenchmen, who apparently hovered on the opposite bank of the river and caused constant night alarms. The king presently sent John Cornwall to Jean Malet, lord of Gravelle, who was conducting the defence¹, requesting him to put a check on these "noisy jabbering yokels²." Malet replied that he had no power over them, whereupon Cornwall made him a bet that before next day he would be over the river himself to see what could be done. "If I succeed," he said, "you shall give me your best courser, with saddle, bridle, and gilt harness; but if I fail, I will give you 2000 crowns to buy a bonnet for your wife³." When Cornwall reported what had passed, the king at once called a council and ordered that boats should be got ready for an immediate crossing. The English had certainly brought with them pontoons and other apparatus for crossing rivers, and these were supplemented with boats made out of wicker and covered with hides. Very early on the following morning 5000 men put across in the darkness, while the attention of the French was diverted by a group of swimmers who splashed and shouted in the water some three miles down stream⁴. Among the first to push off was Cornwall himself, who had with him sixty men in eight small boats and a horse carrying small guns and other necessaries for attack. He disembarked on a small island, where he planted archers to cover the main landing. This statement is hard to accept, seeing that all the islands thereabouts are far nearer to the southern than to the northern bank. Such, however, is the story, and it is added that Cornwall knighted his son on the island⁵, though the boy was only thirteen years old. The important fact is that the English did get across the river by July 14⁶, and we know on the authority of the duke of Clarence that the feat was accomplished without the loss of a man⁷. The French irregulars on the northern bank

¹ Cordeliers, 261; Fenin, 568. For an account of him, see Duranville, i. 36, ii. 41.

² "Rustici garruli et clamosi," Strecche, 272.

³ Ibid. Monstrelet (iii. 275 sq.) has the story in a shorter form, with some unimportant differences in details.

⁴ Tit. Liv. 57.

⁵ Le Fèvre, i. 343.

⁶ News of the crossing had reached Paris by July 15 (St Denys, vi. 260).

⁷ Delpit, 222.

at once melted away¹. The English kept up communications by means of two bridges, which they constructed at Bonport and Les Damps, about a mile below and above the town respectively. Once on the other bank, Gilbert Umfraville built a strong bulwark close to the fort at the bridge-head and set up his banner as a challenge. Upon this a Scotsman shouted in defiance from the walls that the banner would be taken before night, and 5000 men streamed out to capture it. But Umfraville with eighty men drove them all in again, and following them up before they had time to raise the drawbridge, slew crowds of them by shooting through the bars of the portcullis². So, at any rate, it was believed in Kenilworth priory. What is certain is that the garrison soon recognised that resistance was hopeless³, and the town formally capitulated on July 20⁴.

It may well have been a revelation to King Henry to find that the "jabbering yokels" who had plagued him on the north bank were under the command of the lord of Chastellux⁵, who had just helped to seize Paris for the duke of Burgundy. He at once sent a herald to the duke to demand an explanation. The reply left Henry in no doubt as to the actual position. The duke, he saw, was preparing to give battle, and must henceforth be reckoned a "full enemy⁶." For the two cardinals had so far succeeded in their efforts that during their conferences at La Tombe the Armagnacs had agreed to co-operate with the Burgundians in resisting the expected attack on Rouen. To this end the Armagnac admiral Robert de Braquemont was empowered to negotiate with the Burgundian commander at Rouen with a view to securing a united front against the English attack. An arrangement was accordingly signed on June 5, whereby up to next Michaelmas each side, while retaining its badges, was to render help to the other against the common enemy. If the English should appear first before Pont de l'Arche, where the garrison was Armagnac, the men of Rouen were to come to the rescue. If on the contrary Rouen were first assailed, the men of Pont de l'Arche would send help. It was

¹ Norm. Chron. 187; St Denys, vi. 258; Monstr. iii. 276; Cochon, 279.

² Strecche, 271.

³ There seem to have been negotiations earlier (Delpit, 221).

⁴ Ibid. 222; Tit. Liv. 60; Vita, 176; Gesta, 123; Cochon, 279, 342; Bourgeois, 105. For safe-conducts issued to the garrison on July 19, see Rym. ix. 602; Bréquigny, 208.

⁵ He was made captain-general of Normandy on June 26 (Chastellux, 83).

⁶ See the letter of Henry dated July 21 (Delpit, 222). Cf. Gesta, 123.

also stipulated that the Burgundians were to be recognised as the ruling power in Rouen, and that the peasants were to be unmolested in the fields; and provision was made against the possibility of defeat¹. But the compact was too hollow to last. Even before the siege of Pont de l'Arche the duke of Burgundy appointed a new admiral²; and though Braquemont took part in the defence of Pont de l'Arche³, he withdrew from military activity after the surrender⁴. The two parties were soon at each other's throats with envenomed bitterness, but the compact had served some purpose in stiffening the resolve of the garrison of Rouen to resist to the death.

The English had already raided far afield to the north of the river, reaching the very outskirts of Rouen⁵; and as soon as Pont de l'Arche was in his hands, King Henry sent the duke of Exeter with heralds to summon the city to surrender. But the garrison sallied out upon them, and many of the English were slain, complete disaster being averted only by the coolness of the English leader⁶. When news of this insult reached the king, he swore that he would be at Rouen in three days⁷, and he was as good as his word. The army moved forward from Pont de l'Arche on July 29, and that night the king arrived on the flat ground on the eastern side of Rouen⁸.

¹ C. Beurepaire, *Accord*, 309 sqq.

² Anselme, vii. 826.

³ D.K.R. xli. 695.

⁴ See below, p. 152.

⁵ Cochon, 279; *Monstr.* iii. 277.

⁶ J. Page, 2; *Chron. Ric.* II-Hen. VI, p. 46; *Strecche*, 272; *Brut*, ii. 387, 394.

⁷ *Strecche*, 272.

⁸ This date is given by *Strecche* (272), who is confirmed by Page ("The Friday before Lammas Day, the king remevyd in riche array," xii. 6); cf. *Gesta*, 123; *Brut*, ii. 387, 395. *Strecche* says that on the following day the king allotted stations to his various captains; so that the statement (*Vita*, 179; and many modern writers) that the siege began on July 29 is not strictly accurate.

CHAPTER LVII

THE SIEGE OF ROUEN

IN dealing with the topography of Rouen at the time of the siege by Henry V, we are fortunate in possessing an accurate picture of the town as seen from the south bank in 1525¹. Whatever may have happened in the meantime, the external appearance of the city had certainly altered but little. Next in value comes a minute description of the city in 1588 by a Franciscan, Nicholas Taillepie². But above all we have detailed specifications as to the repairing and rebuilding of the eastern portion of the wall between 1405 and 1409³; these are preserved in the city archives and have been worked over with great thoroughness by a band of local antiquaries.

Thanks to these and other sources, we know that King Henry had before him the task of besieging a city enclosed with a high wall some five miles in circumference, rising from the flats by the river to the vine-clad⁴ slopes that encircled it immediately to the west, north, and east, while on the fourth side the wall followed the line of the Seine, where several gates opened on to the quays⁵. On the land side the walls were pierced by five

¹ At this date Jacques le Lieur, one of the *échevins*, who was interested in a scheme for securing a better water supply for the town, drew up exact plans of the buildings abutting on the streets beneath which the new water-pipes were laid. These plans were written on parchment and bound in a book, which is now among the municipal archives in the *Hôtel de Ville*. It has justly been called "one of the most precious documents in the history of a town that it is possible to conceive." The whole has been published in reduced facsimile (Adeline, Rouen au XVI^e siècle). The picture referred to appears in this work and has also been reproduced by Sarrazin (Rouen, 195, Jeanne d'Arc, 145) and by Cook (320). Sarrazin, Rouen, 58, reproduces a picture of Rouen dating from about 1450, but this is of much less value.

² Taillepie, 19. His account of the fortifications, which had been little altered since the time of Henry V, is particularly interesting. A good impression of the strength of the defences can also be obtained from two journals kept during the siege of the town by Henry IV of France in 1591-2, one by a member of the defending force, and one by a captain of the English force that was aiding the king (Farin, i. 156; Coningsby, 7; Richard, 123-128).

³ See esp. Richard, 48, 55, 64, 277 et alibi.

⁴ Cochet, Culture, 340; Grisel, 25, 89.

⁵ Several gates on this side were built afterwards, till the number reached thirteen; but not more than seven seem to have existed in the days of Henry V (C. Beaurepaire, Invent. Rouen, 38; Périaux, Dict. 477, 488; Adeline, 2, Quais, Plate 31; Normandie Monumentale, 4).

strong gates, each fortified with flanking towers and covered by outworks beyond the moat¹. The wall, except of course on the river front, was protected by a deep ditch². More than sixty towers stood at frequent intervals between the gates³, each furnished with three guns, while smaller engines were mounted on the intervening spaces⁴. The great *enceinte* was built by Philip Augustus in place of a much smaller one that had protected the town in Norman times. The same king built the strong castle on the slope of the hill of Bouvreuil at the north-west angle of the walls. It had a great donjon and a strongly fortified bailey, and could be held even though an enemy were in possession of the city that lay at its feet⁵. Of all this elaborate system of defences nothing now survives save the donjon of the castle and some stretches of wall on the northern and eastern sides, though the whole circuit can still be traced by following the line of the modern boulevards, the position of the five gates being marked by open spaces.

Viewed from without, the city seemed a forest of towers and spires, for within its walls, besides the renowned cathedral, were no fewer than thirty-five parish churches and thirty-four religious houses, representing every variety of regular life, chief among which were the abbeys of St Lô, St Amand, and St Ouen. Another of the wonders of the place was the great stone bridge built by the Empress Matilda. It spanned the Seine from the Porte du Pont, in the centre of the river front, to the suburb of Emendreville (now St Sever)⁶. Of its fifteen arches, the four nearest the northern bank were built of wood⁷, so that they might easily be destroyed in case of emergency. These had

¹ The names of the gates, from west to east, were the Porte Cauchoise, the Porte Bouvreuil, the Porte Beauvoisine, the Porte St Hilaire, and the Porte Martainville (Périaux, Dict. 488; Normandie Monumentale, 3; Puisieux, 6; Richard, 301; C. Beurepaire, Invent. Rouen, 30; J. Page, 5; Gesta, 124; Vita, 177).

² J. Page, 4; cf. Puisieux, 5.

³ Ibid. 3 sqq.; cf. Vita, 177; Périaux, 165.

⁴ J. Page, 5; Monstr. iii. 285.

⁵ This castle replaced the old fortress of the dukes of Normandy, which stood near the water side on the ground now occupied by the market-place (Farin, Château, 32). It was mostly demolished in 1590; but we fortunately have Jacques le Lieur's picture of it as it was in 1525 (E. H. Langlois, Note, 103; Farin, i. 99; Ballin, 340. The picture is reproduced in Adeline, i. ii.).

⁶ Joliment, 8; Duranville, 169, 170. For pictures of it in 1608, see Adeline, Quais, nos. 23, 24, 26. Three arches had fallen before 1525, and subsequent representations nearly always show it in ruins. In 1836 it was replaced by a suspension bridge, which rested partly on the old piers, and this in its turn made way for an iron bridge in 1888.

⁷ Chérueil, Dom. Ang. i. 4.

been badly damaged by floods in 1382¹, and if, as seems likely, they remained unrepaired, the value of the bridge was largely destroyed for both sides in the coming struggle. When Henry began his siege, the southern end of the bridge terminated in a barbican known as the Bridge Castle, which was separately fortified on an islet communicating by a drawbridge with the river bank²; and it seems to have caused some apprehension to the besiegers, who stationed a large section of their forces in front of it. In the suburb of Emendreville were several religious houses. No attempt was made to defend these, and the French abandoned and destroyed the famous Galley Close³, an important dockyard on the southern bank, for long famous, though little used for some years past.

Three streams—the Renelle, the Robec, and the Aubele—flowed through the city, and supplied water for its domestic and industrial needs. For Rouen was a manufacturing town, with a lively external trade. By means of the Seine it had easy communication with Paris on the one hand and the English Channel on the other, and the dues paid to the *Vicomté de l'Eau* by ships leaving the port amounted to a vast sum every year⁴. As at Caen, the importance of the guild of porters⁵ is a strong indication of the great volume of its trade. There were numerous other guilds, but by far the most powerful and masterful was that of the drapers, whose statutes, framed in 1424⁶, yield a picture of the industry from which the wealth of the town was chiefly derived. The craft was divided roughly into three branches—weaving, fulling, and shearing—and every apprentice was to be instructed in each branch during his three years' term.

By 1175 the citizens had secured recognition of their rights as a commune under their own mayor⁷, and ever since they had struggled to maintain and extend their liberties in opposition to the claims of archbishops and kings. The

¹ Adeline, Quais, no. 26; Périaux, Dict. 468.

² Duranville, Rouen, 49, 167, 170; A. Duchesne, *Scriptores*, 1208; Farin, i. 100; Valdory, 20; Richard, 80; Puisieux, 91; J. Page, 13.

³ Norm. Chron. 189.

⁴ In 1407 they amounted to 4666 liv. 13 sols (C. Beaurepaire, *Vicomté*, 71). For the text of the *Coutumier de la Vicomté de l'Eau*, see *ibid.* 266, 277. For the trade of Rouen with Paris, Brittany, Spain, Portugal, England and Flanders, see Chéruel, ii. 488; C. Beaurepaire, *Notes*, iii. 246–272. Cf. *Ordonnances*, ix. 413.

⁵ C. Beaurepaire, *Vicomté*, 256, 356.

⁶ *Ordonnances*, xiii. 69; E. H. Langlois, 205–215.

⁷ *Cal. Doc. Franc.* pp. xxii, 8.

government of the city had been in the hands of a mayor, *échevins*, and a council of 100 burgesses known as peers¹. But the disputes of the townfolk with the king culminated in 1382, when they broke into the famous "Harelle," a rising which was only suppressed after fearful havoc and slaughter, and which was followed by the suppression of the commune². It was, however, a time when royal authority was weak; the city soon recovered its defiant spirit, and within a few years Rouen was again governed by its own *échevins*³. Thus when Henry appeared before its walls, the place was virtually in possession of its old privileges. There was a *de facto* mayor, the citizens chose their own officials, and organised their own forces for the defence of the walls⁴.

With such a record, it is small wonder that Rouen was hotly Burgundian. When in May, 1417, the duke of Burgundy's manifesto against the Armagnac government was posted on the church doors⁵, wild rioting broke out in the streets, and it was in vain that the bishop of Lisieux and Guillaume lord of Bacqueville strove to bring the citizens to reason⁶. Towards the end of July it became known that the dauphin was approaching at the head of a strong force⁷. Thereupon the citizens rose, murdered the *bailli*, Raoul de Gaucourt, and flung his deputy over the bridge into the Seine⁸. When the dauphin appeared before the town next day (July 25), he was refused admission⁹; but after a part of his forces had been admitted to the castle, which remained loyal, negotiations were opened, with the result that he pardoned the rebellious townsmen and was suffered to enter the city as an assertion of his authority¹⁰, though his foreign mercenaries, eager for plunder, had to remain outside¹¹. The city paid a tallage of 16,000 livres and advanced a loan of 1200,

¹ Chéruei, Commune, i. 269; C. Beaurepaire, Vicomté, 279, 328, 332.

² Chéruei, Commune, ii. 435 sqq., 551, pt. II. 115; Périaux, Dict. 660.

³ Chéruei, Commune, ii. 475.

⁴ C. Beaurepaire, Invent. Rouen, 28, 30, 35, 39, 40; Félix, I. p. xv; Chéruei, Commune, ii. 496, App. 48.

⁵ Cagny, 108; Bouquet, Notice, 185.

⁶ Norm. Chron. 177; Masseville, iv. 59; Hellot, Martel, 102.

⁷ Cochon, 341; Vallet de Viriville, i. 53.

⁸ Norm. Chron. 177; Cagny, 108; St Denys, vi. 94; Chéruei, Commune, ii. 523. Gaucourt had been appointed *bailli* of Rouen in December, 1415 (Baye, ii. 230). He was lord of Argicourt and Maisons-sur-Seine (Anselme, viii. 367; Chéruei, Dom. Ang. pt. II. 14; Fallue, ii. 318), and must not be confounded with the defender of Harfleur.

⁹ St Denys, vi. 92, 93; Norm. Chron. 178; Fenin, 591; Le Fèvre, i. 296.

¹⁰ For the agreement, see Chéruei, Dom. Ang. i. 30, pt. II. 23 sqq.

¹¹ Cochon, 341.

and the castle was put under the command of Jean d'Harcourt, count of Aumale, nephew of the archbishop¹. But the dauphin had to hurry away to defend Paris from the duke of Burgundy, and no sooner had he gone than the townfolk again declared for the duke and no taxation². Before the end of the year they entered into communication with Guy le Bouteiller, commander of the Burgundian garrison at Dieppe. He brought over 1400 or 1500 men, drove out the Armagnacs from the castle, and became captain of Rouen, the citizens paying the wages of his troops³. The new-comers were at first regarded as "more English than French⁴," but when Paris was in the power of the Burgundians and Henry's army was believed to be approaching, garrison and townfolk alike were for offering resistance. Early in the spring, indeed, some of the burgesses had presented themselves before the count of Charolais at Amiens asking for help against the English, who were hourly expected to begin the siege; but though the count promised aid, he sent none⁵. However, as soon as the revolution had been effected in the capital, urgent messages were sent thither, and promptly answered by the despatch of 600 fighting men, including 300 archers⁶.

It is usual nowadays to say that the position of Rouen, commanded as it is by a half-circle of hills, is such as to render defence hopeless; and under modern conditions of warfare this is doubtless true. But in the Middle Ages the very converse was the fact. The hills, it is true, were very near; but the range of artillery was short, and so far from being at the mercy of an attacker, Rouen might fairly claim to have been unconquered. In the eleventh century French attempts to take it had twice been repelled. It had indeed yielded to Philip Augustus in 1204 after forty days' resistance; but the inhabitants were disgusted at their abandonment by King John and had no zeal for his cause. During the rising of 1382 the royal troops had never been expelled from the castle, and the king therefore had no great difficulty in recovering the town. But with town and castle in the same hands there is no doubt that

¹ Chéruef, *Dom. Ang.* i. 31; *Beaucourt*, i. 73; cf. *Juv.* 539.

² *Cousinot*, 164. The dauphin left about Aug. 5 (*Beaucourt*, i. 72).

³ *St Denys*, vi. 148; *Norm. Chron.* 183; *Bourgeois*, 84; *Juv.* 539; *Cochon*, 340; *Chéruef*, *Dom. Ang.* i. 36, pt. II. 22; *Puiseux*, *Dict.* 62; *Th. Bouquet*, 312.

⁴ *Cochon*, 278.

⁵ *Monstr.* iii. 250.

⁶ *St Denys*, vi. 290; *Cordeliers*, 261.

the English had before them a gigantic task. The dissensions of a year before were buried, and all in the town were ready to obey the instructions of the duke of Burgundy. As chief civil officer they elected Jean Segneult, who regularly signed his proclamations as "having the justice and jurisdiction of the office of mayor¹." The military defence was in the hands of Guy le Bouteiller, together with Guillaume Houdetot², who was *bailli*, Alain Blanchard³, who had planned the rising of the previous year and was now captain of the crossbowmen, and Jean Jourdain, who commanded the gunners⁴. The clergy were as Burgundian in their sympathies as the townsfolk⁵. The archbishop, Louis d'Harcourt⁶, who was identified with the Armagnacs, kept quite away, and the leadership of the clergy fell into the hands of Master Robert de Livet, one of the cathedral canons, who in spite of his sixty-five years, threw himself heartily into the spirit of the defence and pronounced the excommunication of the English king⁷. As soon as Rouen had been restored to Burgundian control in the previous winter, an order from Troyes had commanded the destruction of all churches and other buildings in the suburbs that might afford shelter to the English⁸. These drastic measures were doubtless postponed till the last moment, but when the duke of Exeter arrived, he found all churches, houses, and hedges outside the walls levelled with the ground, the suburbs stripped "as bare as my hand," and their inhabitants huddled within the town⁹.

That the inhabitants did not anticipate a long siege is shown by their admitting enormous numbers of outsiders just before the gates were finally closed. The figures given by English

¹ Sarrazin, Jeanne d'Arc, 152, 155; Th. Bouquet, 192. It had been the official formula before the mayoralty was abolished (Chérueil, Commune, pt. II. 35, 38), and in the capitulation Segneult is called mayor (*ibid.* App. 48; Rym. ix. 667).

² Chérueil, Dom. Ang. i. 33; A. Martin, Fécamp, i. 124; Fallue, ii. 328.

³ Chérueil, Dom. Ang. i. 22, pt. II. 33 sqq. Monstrelet (iii. 305) calls him "capitaine du menu commun," and Waurin "le capitaine du menu peuple," ii. 262.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 305.

⁵ Fallue, ii. 325.

⁶ Third son of John, third count of Harcourt (Pommeraye, 340), born in 1382 (*Gall. Christ.* xi. 85), chosen archbishop by the chapter "propter natalium splendorem" in 1407 (*Gams*, 614; *Eubel*, i. 448). Owing to disputes with the pope, he did not make his entry into Rouen till 1416.

⁷ Chérueil, Dom. Ang. i. 21; Waurin, ii. 262; Monstr. l.c.; C. Beaurepaire, *Invent. Rouen*, 43, 45.

⁸ Dated Jan. 30, 1418 (Périaux, 169; Chérueil, Dom. Ang., pt. II. 3; Puisieux, 56).

⁹ J. Page, 3; *Strecche*, 272; *Brut*, ii. 395; *Archæologia*, xxii. 385; *Norm. Chron.* 189; Sarrazin, Jeanne d'Arc, 353.

writers are no doubt greatly exaggerated¹, but they bear witness to the general impression among the besiegers that the town was terribly overcrowded. As for its normal population, a census of heads of households in thirty-three parishes, taken in 1274², affords reason for the belief that the population then was about 70,000³. There followed a period of prosperity, when the town certainly grew, but the Black Death inflicted frightful loss⁴ and the troubles of the Harelle had further reduced the number of inhabitants. We know from an official statement of 1409 that many houses had been demolished and the population had greatly diminished⁵, while two years later the city was said to be in great part uninhabited and in danger of being abandoned by traders⁶. Henry V, on the other hand, described it as "the most notable place in France save Paris⁷," and though he had a motive for exaggerating its greatness, his words suggest that perhaps its decline had not really been so disastrous as the reports just cited make out. Modern writers have been as free as contemporaries with estimates of the number of people in the city during the siege, but their figures are only guesswork. It is certain that the town was very full, and that at first all were full of confidence and so free from apprehensions of famine that bread was allowed to be sold in the market on every weekday, instead of on Fridays only, as was the rule in normal times⁸.

Little is known of the siege of Rouen from the standpoint of the defenders, for the records of the deliberations of the town officials are missing from Feb. 28, 1412 to April 18, 1447⁹.

¹ J. Page (14) gives 410,000, including the garrison, which he estimates at about 30,000. Otterbourne, whose figure is 270,000, is one of the most modest (p. 282).

² Chéruel, *Commune*, i. 284.

³ So Puisieux, 15, and Coville, *Recherches*, 386. The estimate of Périaux, however, is only 40,000 to 50,000 (*Dict.* p. xii).

⁴ Puisieux, 16, though it is impossible to believe his statement that 100,000 people perished in four months.

⁵ *Ordonnances*, ix. 413; C. Beaurepaire, *Vicomté*, 72; Puisieux, 14; E. Fréville, i. 270.

⁶ *Ordonnances*, ix. 413; Chéruel, *Dom. Ang.*, pt. II. 2; Périaux, 165 sq.; cf. Puisieux, 14; Coville, *Recherches*, 398.

⁷ In a letter, dated Aug. 10, 1418, to the mayor of London (Delpit, 223); Chéruel, *Dom. Ang.*, pt. II. 159.

⁸ Orders had been given that all should lay in supplies for ten months (*Monstr.* iii. 282; Waurin, ii. 246), but doubtless this only affected the regular inhabitants.

⁹ Called "Livres de Deliberations des Echevins," the extant volumes of which are preserved in the *Hôtel de Ville* (cf. La Quérière, 26; Lefèvre-Pontalis, lvii. 9). It has long been supposed that the missing books were carried off by the English, but the lacuna begins seven years before the English occupation and ends a year or two before their departure. No trace of the missing books has been found in England; there is moreover another gap from 1396 to 1403 (C. Beaurepaire, *Invent. Rouen*, 46; Richard, 69).

But from the standpoint of the besiegers we have information of quite exceptional interest. In the first place we have a description of the siege by Titus Livius, whose direct personal intercourse with the duke of Gloucester and other leaders who were present gave him excellent opportunity for compiling an accurate account. The elaborate academic dress of his narrative, however, not only fatigues the reader, but leaves the impression that the author thought more of his style than his facts. Very different is an account of the siege written in homely English by a plain soldier named John Page, who was in the English force throughout the operations against the town¹. Under his hand the story quickens into instant life, and plants us under the very walls of the beleaguered city. Who Page was nobody has been able to discover². But he was evidently a man with eyes to see and the wit to tell what he saw. He tells his tale plainly, and himself says that he wrote it down in a hurry, but meant to mend it after the war if he came through alive³. But it instantly took the fancy of the Londoners, who read it greedily, and a generation later a skinner named William Gregory of Aldermary, who became mayor of London in 1451⁴, had every word of it copied in a commonplace book, which is now preserved in the British Museum⁵. Contrary to what is usual in such cases of literary good intentions, Page did live to amend his poem, and we are able to read it also in its more polished form⁶;

¹ J. Page, pp. xi, 1; *Archaeologia*, xxi. 44, 48.

² Apparently the only man of the name who figures in the Great Roll of 1417 was an archer in the retinue of Philip Leche (*Brit. Mus. Add. MS.* 24,704, f. 102).

³

“All in raff and not in rime
Bycause of space he hadde no tyme,
And when thys werre ys at an hende
And he have liffe he wylle hit a mende.” J. Page, 46.

⁴ *Greg., Chron.* pp. iv, 197.

⁵ Egerton MS. 1995. The first version of the poem is printed in “*Historical Collections of a London citizen*” (*Cam. Soc.*), 1-45, to which reference is made.

⁶ Partly printed by J. Conybeare in 1827 in *Archaeologia*, xxi. 48-78, from Bodl. MS. 124, and completed by F. Madden in 1829 (*ibid.* xxii. 361-384), from *Harl. MSS.* 753 and 2256. References to the duke of Clarence and to the king show that the first version must have been written before the battle of Baugé, and the second version between that event and Henry's death. (Cf. J. Page, 25, and *Archaeologia*, xxi. 70.) A sixteenth-century copy of the second version, made for a London alderman, is at Balliol College, Oxford (*Balliol MS.* 354 [38], fol. 128). The text is not identical with that of Conybeare, as supposed by Coxe, *Balliol*, 112, and Brie, 72. The MS. is described by E. Flügel in *Anglia*, xxvi. (1903), 94. The manuscript was afterwards collated with the others by Dr R. Dyboski, who generously communicated the results.

but, as might have been expected, his first version is certainly the better¹.

Like every Englishman of his time, Page believed that the French were keeping King Henry out of his right². He had a profound admiration for the king, whom he regarded as "the child of God" and "the royallest prince in Christendom³," and for his brothers the dukes of Clarence and Gloucester⁴. From his frequent mention of Sir Gilbert Umfraville, it seems likely that he was stationed under him on the south bank of the river. He had a chivalrous respect for the valour of the enemy⁵, though he denounces their demolition of churches and religious houses as a "cursed deed⁶."

It seems impossible to ascertain the exact strength of the force under King Henry when he began his uphill task, but it was certainly small, and without the reinforcements that afterwards arrived he would probably have failed. It was recognised from the outset that lives must not be wasted in assaults and that the city must be starved into surrender. Some days were spent in securing the ground before the walls, which had been set with caltrops and other entanglements⁷, and many lives were lost before the blockade was complete. On Aug. 1, however, an order was issued that each captain should occupy his appointed ground⁸, and when all was ready, the king took up his quarters in the new Charterhouse, lately built at the foot of Mont Gargane, about a mile away from the walls on the eastern side⁹. Here he established his staff of non-combatants and transacted official business, but for fighting purposes he set up his pavilion close to the Porte St Hilaire, opposite the north-eastern corner of the enceinte. The duke of Clarence lay

¹ Page's work was perhaps used by Otterbourne, who finished his chronicle in 1420 (cf. Otterbourne, 282, with J. Page, 18; *Archaeologia*, xxii. 393). A long extract from the second version is embodied in the *Brut*, ii. 404-422. The Agincourt ballad, printed in Nicolas, ends with fourteen lines from Page's poem (p. 77). His work was certainly used by Strecche (272), *Gesta* (127), *Tit. Liv.* (65), *Vita* (195), *Peter. Chron.*, Rous, and of course by several of the sixteenth-century chroniclers. For a modern estimate of Page's poem, see Kingsford, *Lit.* 116 sqq.

² J. Page, 22, 26, 33.

⁴ *Ibid.* 7, 11, 25.

⁶ *Ibid.* 3.

⁸ *Ibid.* 6.

³ *Ibid.* 26, 27.

⁵ *Ibid.* 14.

⁷ *Ibid.* 5.

⁹ *Norm. Chron.* (Williams) 191, (Hellot) 46; *Monstr.* iii. 283; *Le Fèvre*, i. 344; *Waurin*, ii. 219; *Cochon*, 280. The house was founded by Archbishop Guillaume de Lestrange in 1384 (*Farin*, pt. v. 127). The wall which surrounded it still remains, but nothing of the building is left save the four walls of the chapel. The monastery had apparently been spared by the townsfolk because of its distance from the fortifications.

at the ruined abbey of St Gervais fronting the Porte Cauchoise, and covered all the ground on the west as far as the river bank¹. The castle and the Porte Bouvreuil were watched by the Earl Marshal, the slopes outside the Porte Beauvoisine by the duke of Exeter². Communication between these four great camps was maintained by deep shelter-trenches³. The flat ground to the south of the Seine was held by a large force under the earl of Huntingdon⁴.

The first task of the besiegers was to isolate the abbey of St Catherine's, which stood on the top of the steep hill to the east of the town. This hill was separated from the wall by about a mile of flat marshy land known as the Martainville Fields, across which a causeway eight or ten feet high formed the only means of communication⁵. To the north of the causeway the ground was intersected by the channels of the Aubeite and the Robec, while to the south⁶ it was exposed to floods from the Seine. The great and famous abbey of St Catherine⁷ had recently been enclosed by a strong wall, with towers and fortified gates, and thenceforward it was commonly known as St Catherine's Castle⁸. In later days it became a maxim that whoever held St Catherine's held Rouen in his hand⁹; but in the early fifteenth century this was not yet true. Still, the capture of the place was vital to the English, for until this was effected they could not effectually blockade the eastern side of the town—the very quarter from which relief was expected to arrive. For some time after the other gates were blockaded, communications passed between the abbey and the town by the Martainville gate in spite of the vigilance of the earl of Salisbury,

¹ J. Page, 3, 6; Norm. Chron. (Williams) 187, (Hellot) 41; Strecche, 272; Paston Lett. i. 10; Bréquigny, 73.

² J. Page, 42.

³ Monstr. iii. 284; Le Fèvre, i. 344.

⁴ Dugdale, Baronage, i. 245; Le Fèvre, i. 344; Monstr. iii. 284; Brut, ii. 388. The lodgments of the different leaders, as described above, are all originally given in Page (7, 23). They appear also in Tit. Liv. (61), Vita (180), Strecche (273), Peter. Chron. (448), Paston Lett. (i. 10), Monstr. (iii. 283 sq., with variations), Norm. Chron. (187, with variations). For various discrepancies, see Archaeol. xxii. 386.

⁵ For a description of the ground and the causeway, see Richard, 77, 80, 83 et passim.

⁶ Now the Champ de Mars (Richard, 185).

⁷ Gall. Christ. xi. 124.

⁸ Tit. Liv. 60; Vita, 180; Gesta, 124; Rym. ix. 619; Périaux, 170, Dict. 600; Coningsby, 27, 29, 40. Fifteenth-century pictures of it are reproduced by Montfaucon, iii. 240, and Sarrazin, 130. It was destroyed in 1597 (Langlois, Forteresses, 102), and few traces of it are left.

⁹ Taillepié, 23.

who was posted with a strong force in a precarious position at the foot of the hill¹. Resolved to stop this intercourse, the English chose a dark night and planted strong shelters on the ground between the hill and the city, and from these launched a vigorous assault on the abbey. The approach over the precipitous ground was all against the attackers, the alarm was given in the abbey, and the attack was beaten off². But the mere attempt was evidence to the garrison that a vital point had been lost, and finding his communications with Rouen severed, the captain resolved to capitulate while there was yet time. Accordingly on Aug. 31³ a document was signed whereby the garrison were to evacuate the place, leaving their horses, armour, artillery, and other munitions of war, on the understanding that the abbey and its relics should be spared and its lands and other property remain in undisputed possession of the abbot⁴. The English marched in on Sept. 1, and henceforth the earl of Salisbury's detachment was set free to strengthen the chain that was tightening round the city.

From the first it had been evident that the besiegers must draw largely upon England for their supplies, and the records contain plenty of evidence of the passage of beer, wine, victuals, utensils, and munitions of war⁵. Most of these supplies were shipped to Harfleur, a fleet of vessels supplied by the friendly king of Portugal being stationed at the entrance of the Seine to keep the waterway open⁶. From Harfleur they were forwarded in smaller craft under convoy as far up the river as possible⁷, but at first they were exposed to great risk of capture at Caudebec, where the river was dominated by the fortress on

¹ Nagerel, 172; Norm. Chron. (Hellot) 41. Salisbury had with him Edward Holland count of Mortain (Bréquigny, 35; Brut, ii. 388), Henry Lord Fitzhugh (Rym. ix. 619), and Philip Leche of Chatsworth (Puisseux, 83; Cook, 180).

² Tit. Liv. 62 sq.; Norm. Chron. 189.

³ Rym. ix. 619; Pommeraye, 34; Monstr. iii. 284; Le Fèvre, i. 345; Waurin, ii. 249. For safe-conduct to Jean Noblet, who had conducted the defence as lieutenant for the captain of Rouen, see D.K.R. xli. 697. After the siege of the town was over, the bulwarks of St Catherine's were demolished, some of the material being given to the abbot to repair the steeple of the abbey church and the rest used for the various new works that the king took in hand to strengthen his hold on the city (D.K.R. xli. 801).

⁴ Guillaume le Mesle (Bréquigny, 43; D.K.R. xli. 705; Puisseux, 104; Gall. Christ. xi. 129).

⁵ e.g. Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 204; Iss. Roll 6 Hen. V, Pasch., Aug. 1, 1418; *ibid.* 6 Hen. V, Mich., Oct. 27, 1418, Feb. 24, 1419; *ibid.* 7 Hen. V, Pasch., July 3, 1419. On Sept. 8, 1418 the mayor of London despatched great plenty of victuals from Gravesend, together with thirty butts of sweet wine, 1000 pipes of ale, and 2500 cups, for "your hoste to drink of," Delpit, 225; Puisseux, 112.

⁶ Tit. Liv. 62.

⁷ Delpit, 223; Tyler, ii. 225, 226.

the northern bank and blocked by vessels sent from Rouen¹. It therefore became imperative to reduce Caudebec, and with this object the earl of Warwick (who had just arrived from Domfront) was sent thither with Gilbert Talbot and a body of troops². So pressing was the need that the king is said to have gone with the force to direct operations³. Some modern writers have supposed that Caudebec made a heroic resistance, and indeed it would have rendered an inestimable service to Rouen by doing so. As a matter of fact, however, six days sufficed to bring the garrison to terms⁴, and on Sept. 9 it was agreed that the fate of Caudebec should be that of Rouen, and until this was decided it should abstain from any hostile action and, while retaining its English prisoners, should treat them well⁵. As a guarantee for the execution of this singular treaty, the garrison gave hostages, who were kept in St Catherine's abbey⁶. The earl of Warwick transferred his men to strengthen the besieging force at Rouen.

Some time before, the English had gained an important success at Quillebeuf, on the south bank of the Seine, by the dispersal of a band of 400 desperadoes who had been intercepting supplies coming up the river, eighty of them, including three prominent leaders, being captured on Aug. 16⁷. Thus after the neutralisation of Caudebec the way was clear for the passage of a whole fleet of vessels, and ere long 100 ships were at anchor off Croisset and Quévilly⁸.

Attempts were made to run the blockade from outside and in. Armed vessels for this purpose were equipped at Le Crotoy and Abbeville with the special object of getting food into Rouen⁹. But the English stationed armed craft in mid-stream to pounce upon any French vessel that tried to approach or leave the town¹⁰. Above the bridge, about a gunshot from the town, chains were stretched from bank to bank, either buoyed on casks or fastened to piles¹¹. To guard the upper reaches of the

¹ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 190, (Hellot) 44.

² J. Page, 7; Norm. Chron. (Williams) 190, (Hellot) 45.

³ Peter. Chron. 489, but this is not mentioned by J. Page.

⁴ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 190, (Hellot) 45; cf. J. Page, 10.

⁵ Rym. ix. 620.

⁶ D.K.R. xli. 707.

⁷ Tit. Liv. 64; Vita, 190; Wals. ii. 329, Hypodig. 486.

⁸ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 190, (Hellot) 44; Strutt, Manners, ii. 126, Plate XLIII; Chron. Ric. II-Hen. VI, 47; Brut, ii. 389, 396; J. Page, 10; Peter. Chron. 489.

⁹ Itin. 614.

¹⁰ Tit. Liv. 61.

¹¹ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 189, 240, (Hellot) 43; Strecche, 273; J. Page, 10; Monstr. iii. 284; Le Fèvre, i. 344.

river the English dragged ships overland across the intervening flats on the south side and then launched them again in the reaches beyond St Catherine's¹. To secure his communications Henry threw a wooden bridge across the river from Lescure, where he could take advantage of certain islands, to a point between Sotteville and St Étienne du Rouvray, the planks being laid on chains made fast to piles that were driven into the bed of the stream². Such measures offer striking evidence of Henry's determination to render complete the isolation of the garrison.

One or two minor successes in other parts were gained by the English during August, 1418. On the 18th 400 Frenchmen entered the suburbs of Évreux, but were chased out by the small English garrison, who killed twelve of them, and captured four prisoners and forty horses³. Two days later a French force 1000 strong appeared before the walls of Louviers, where they had established an understanding with some of the townsfolk⁴; but, according to an English writer, the English commander sallied out with one hundred men and beat them off, taking 180 prisoners, all men of consideration⁵. These successes, with that at Quillebeuf, fell within the Octave of the Assumption, and were attributed to the special intervention of the Virgin, to whom Henry always paid special reverence⁶. It is improbable, however, that the French forces engaged were much more than bands of marauders. The approach of an organised body of 1000 men must have drawn off some of the troops besieging Rouen.

Meanwhile the inhabitants of Rouen were looking in vain for the expected relief. In September came a letter from the University of Paris, which told that their case had often been brought to the notice of the king and the duke of Burgundy, who had always returned a gracious reply: in fact, a force had already been set on foot to help them and relieve Caudebec. For the present let them take heart and defend themselves, for the

¹ Tit. Liv. 61 sq. Strecche (273) says that they dragged them for two miles over the roads with their sails set. Cf. Vita, 182.

² Cochoch, 280; Tit. Liv. 61; Vita, 182; J. Page, 10; Brut, ii. 388. John Janyn, who had made the hide pontoons (see above, p. 59, n. 1), was employed both on the barrier of chains and on this bridge (For. Accts. 57, C). There is a record of his charge "ad iaciendam unam magnam catenam ferream super pilis ultra aquam ad custodiendam aquam de Seen." The chain was forged on the spot, though the order for it had been given at Westminster on Feb. 8, 1417. It was afterwards used at several other sieges.

³ Wals. ii. 329. Walsingham says that the English force numbered eleven.

⁴ D.K.R. xli. 716.

⁵ Wals. ii. 329.

⁶ Ibid.

fall of Rouen would mean the irrevocable loss of all that region and would imperil the safety of the rest of the kingdom¹. But nothing is known of the relieving force mentioned in the letter, unless it were the body of 2000 men which got within ten miles of the city before being cut up by John Cornwall, who had been sent with 600 mounted men to deal with them². The prospects of the defenders in fact grew steadily worse. After the siege of Caudebec the earl of Warwick was stationed at the Martainville gate, having under him John Neville and Edmund Lord Ferrers of Chartley³. Not long afterwards the king's division was reinforced by the arrival of 3000 men from Cherbourg under the duke of Gloucester, who had with him Lord Abergavenny and the earl of Suffolk. Though the front lines of the besiegers were in general but a bow-shot from the ramparts⁴, Gloucester's force was posted nearer the walls than any other detachment and was much exposed to missiles of all kinds from the town⁵. Late in the autumn there also arrived a force of some 1500 Irish kernes under the command of Thomas Butler, the fighting prior of the Knights Hospitallers at Kilmainham near Dublin⁶. There were already Irish troops in the king's army, but the arrival of Butler's men excited special interest, for they were dressed and equipped in Irish fashion⁷. They wore no breeches and went with one foot bare⁸. Their arms were a targe, a bundle of small darts, and a great knife carried at the waist. The few mounted men rode their little nags cleverly, using pads instead of saddles "like a corn-chandler⁹." The French, whom they greatly astonished, over-

¹ Denifle, *Chart.* iv. 350; Boulay, v. 334.

² Fenin, 105; Monstr. iii. 301 sq.

³ J. Page, 9, 10, 11; Strecche, 273; Brut, ii. 389, 396; Paston Letters, i. 10; Rous (Hearne), 367; Monstr. iii. 283.

⁴ Cochon, 280.

⁵ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 191, (Hellot) 46; J. Page, 11, 16; Tit. Liv. 64; Vita, 190.

⁶ J. Page, 12; Brut, ii. 389, 397. For Butler, see Wylie, ii. 130, iii. 169 sqq. He seems to have been acquitted of the charges brought against him at the end of the reign of Henry IV (*ibid.* iii. 171; Rot. Parl. iv. 199; Cal. Rot. Hib. i. 211, 213). The arrival of his troops had evidently been eagerly awaited, for in June, 1418, the king ordered that shipping should be sent from Bristol to Waterford to transport the prior and his men (Chanc. Warr., Ser. 1, 1364/59; Excerpt. Hist. 388), and soon afterwards certain masters and sailors of Bristol received money for embarking the prior, 200 men-at-arms, and 300 archers (Devon, 356, July 1, 1418). These can hardly have been the Irish kernes, but in the autumn the prior received £100 to bring them to Southampton (Iss. Roll 6 Hen. V, Mich., Oct. 17, 1418); and on Oct. 27 an order was issued to the mayor and bailiff of that port to provide shipping to carry him and his retinue to France (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 202).

⁷ J. Page, 12.

⁸ Monstr. iii. 284 sq.

⁹ *Ibid.* 285; Le Fèvre, i. 345; Waurin, ii. 249.

estimated their numbers¹ and under-estimated their military value². They were at any rate expert foragers, and swept to some purpose the country-side near Rouen, where men long remembered the spectacle they presented as they came back from their raids, with beds, baggage, and even babies in cradles tied to the backs of the cattle they were driving. They did not take kindly to Henry's discipline, and after a time the king had to send to prior Butler a sharp message that if they did not conform to orders they would be flogged and otherwise punished³. They were at first posted on the north side of the town⁴.

As at Harfleur, the king exercised a close supervision over the minutest details. He issued a code of rules for the discipline of the army and saw to it that they were put into effect. He personally directed the despatch of armed detachments to convoy and protect provisions gathered from the adjacent country. Night and day, in storm and calm alike, he went the round of the camps, contriving and correcting with sleepless activity⁵. If any tents were pitched too far afield, his eye detected what was wrong and he had them moved nearer to the lines. When his orders were disobeyed, he hanged the offenders⁶.

Meanwhile the French rained showers of stones and quarrels among the English tents, the guns and engines on the walls sometimes discharging a hundred shots in an hour⁷. Time after time the defenders broke out from all the gates at once in solid masses of 1000 men, but in hand-to-hand fighting the English drove them back to the shelter of their walls and towers, though they often revenged themselves when the pursuers had been lured on to the treacherous ground, set with pitfalls and caltrops, near the gates⁸. At every such repulse, however, the defence weakened, and King Henry rendered sorties still more hopeless by encircling the town with a trench fenced with sharp stakes and mounting on its ramparts guns to play on the

¹ Monstrelet (iii. 284 sq.) gives their numbers as 8000, while Waurin (ii. 249) puts them at 20,000.

² Monstr. iii. 285; Waurin, ii. 250.

³ D.K.R. xli. 720; Gesta, 125.

⁴ J. Page, 12.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 63; Vita, 188.

⁶ For Thomas Croware and John Calf, lately hanged "pro offensis factis contra Regem," see D.K.R. xli. 296.

⁷ Tit. Liv. 62; Vita, 184, 186; J. Page, 15; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 42.

⁸ Tit. Liv. 62; Vita, 185; Monstr. iii. 285; Le Fèvre, i. 344, 345; Waurin, ii. 246; Fenin, 569; J. Page, 8, 15.

ground between it and the walls¹. As usual in mediæval sieges, personal challenges passed from one side to the other, and operations were sometimes suspended while both sides watched a single-handed fight. Such an incident occurred at the very beginning of the siege, when John Blount, lieutenant of the duke of Exeter at Harfleur, challenged the captain of the Porte Cauchoise to break three lances with him. The Frenchman accepted the challenge, came out to the lists with thirty comrades, unhorsed his enemy, and pierced him through the body. The corpse was then dragged within the walls and only given up for burial on payment of 400 nobles². As the siege went on, however, a growing exasperation manifested itself on both sides, and a spirit of brutality developed. The English tried to frighten the besieged by hanging prisoners on the gibbet that stood in full view on the northern heights; while the French fastened dogs to the beards and necks of any Englishmen they could catch and hanged them on a gallows which they fixed up in the ditch beneath the walls³, or tied them in sacks and flung them into the Seine⁴.

The townsmen soon began to suffer. The water supply was seriously reduced when the English effectually dammed the Renelle before it reached the town⁵. By the beginning of October the stock of food was giving out⁶. All grain and meal had been consumed, and such bread as could be had was made of bran⁷. None was exposed in the market, and such sales as took place were made secretly, for if food was seen in the streets, the hungry mob fell on it and could not be beaten off⁸. A slice of bread the size of one's hand could not be had for less than a franc, and young girls would sacrifice their honour to get one⁹. Leeks and turnips sold for a shilling each. Docks were eaten root and rind. Water tinged with vinegar had to serve for wine. For flesh meat the besieged ate not only their skinny horses, but also cats, rats, dogs, mice and any such

¹ J. Page, 17; Strecche, 273; Monstr. iii. 284; Le Fèvre, i. 344; Waurin, ii. 248. It was perhaps to help in digging and fortifying the trench that Henry brought from Harfleur the 200 labourers and carpenters who on Oct. 3, 1418, were owed £258. 18s. 3d. in wages (Iss. Roll 6 Hen. V, Mich.).

² Monstr. iii. 286. The Frenchman was the Bastard of Arly. Blount's death occurred before Aug. 9 (Rym. ix. 595).

³ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 189, (Hellot) 43; La Quérière, Notice, 173.

⁴ Otterbourne, 128.

⁵ La Quérière, Fontaines, 55.

⁶ Monstr. iii. 299.

⁷ J. Page, 18.

⁸ Monstr. iii. 300.

⁹ Le Fèvre, i. 353.

vermin as they could lay their hands on, all commanding a high price¹.

As time went on, communication between the city and the outer world became more and more difficult. Towards the end of October, however, messengers got out, made their way to Paris, and on the 27th appeared before the Council, where with broken voices they implored the duke of Burgundy not to abandon them². In point of fact, the *ban* and *arrière-ban* had already been proclaimed with a view to the relief of Rouen, and the University of Paris had exhorted the cities not to stand on their privileges, but to do whatever they could to aid the besieged city³. The duke therefore declared (to the surprise of the envoys) that if the men of Rouen would hold out a little longer, he would certainly come to their help and take the king with him. This announcement was welcomed with great joy in Paris; the excommunication under which the duke lay was annulled; and the king went solemnly to Notre Dame to pray for a blessing on the coming rescue⁴. On Nov. 17 he took the oriflamme at St Denis⁵, and on Nov. 24 went out with the queen and the duke to join a large force that had gathered at Pontoise⁶. As for the messengers from Rouen, they returned home and told that the duke was coming with 300,000 men to the rescue, that he was less than twenty miles away, and that next Friday would see him before the walls⁷. The bells, which had been silent since the siege began, rang out wild peals of joy; the churches were thronged with townsmen giving thanks; and the streets echoed with shouts of exultation⁸. Outside the walls the prospect of sharp fighting was hailed with delight. The king's heart leapt up, for he felt that a decisive battle might be coming at last. He called his captains together and said, "Fellows, be merry⁹!" The Irish troops were posted on

¹ "For xxx d. went a ratte, For ii nobles went a catte," J. Page, 18. Cf. Paston Lett. i. 10; Tit. Liv. 65, 66; Vita, 195 sq.; Gesta, 196; Otterbourne, 282, reading "mures" for "sues," where the prices given differ from those of Page; Strecche, 274; Nicolas, App. 77; Héron, 78; Verneuil, 220; Fenin, 569; Basin, i. 32; Monstr. iii. 299; Le Fèvre, i. 352.

² St Denys, vi. 299, 304. The besieged had already appealed to the dauphin, but his answer must have been a sham, for he was all the time bargaining with the English (Juv. 545).

³ Ordonnances, x. 482; Denifle, Chart. iv. 356.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 286; Vallet de Virville, i. 141.

⁵ St Denys, vi. 300.

⁶ Fauquembergue, i. 202; Félibien, ii. 795, iv. 575; Comines, i. 370.

⁷ J. Page, 16.

⁸ Ibid.; Tit. Liv. 65.

⁹ J. Page, 16.

the road to the east leading to the Forest of Lyons, so as to be the first in touch with any relieving force. Every man lay in his harness through the night¹. The king strengthened his position on the northern side of the city, where rumour said the attack would come, as the quarter presenting most difficulty to the besiegers². Where the approach to the trench was open, it was fortified with banks and wooden towers, on which were mounted guns and engines³. But the Burgundians never came. Henry had letters forged and conveyed into the town by pretended messengers in order to fill the defenders with false hope⁴. He also bade some of his men don the St Andrew's cross and rush out of a wood towards the English lines, his object being to entice the garrison to sally out to their assistance—a ruse which wholly failed. The truth was that the force at Pontoise was paralysed by disaffection. Some held that the time of year was not fit for campaigning⁵; others were secretly on the side of the dauphin, whose men were in possession of Soissons and Compiègne⁶ and threatened to oppose the relieving force. In any case the army was much smaller than it should have been, many of the nobles having disobeyed the summons to appear⁷. Money was also short, despite the imposition of a new tax on wine and an attempt to raise a loan of 10,000 livres⁸; and it was to little purpose that on Dec. 12 the University of Paris, after hearing a piteous letter from Rouen, voted 1000 livres towards its relief⁹. After five weeks spent idly at Pontoise¹⁰, the army moved north to Beauvais in search of food, their own provisions having all been eaten, but they found that the Armagnacs had swept the ground bare and were barring the roads against any traders that were ready to sell to them¹¹. To Beauvais came

¹ J. Page, 16.

² *Ibid.* 12; *Archaeol.* xxi. 58; Pottier, in *Puiseux*, 243.

³ *Tit. Liv.* 65; *Vita*, 194.

⁴ *Basin*, i. 33.

⁵ *St Denys*, vi. 294.

⁶ *Cordeliers*, 262; *Monstr.* iii. 279 sq., 292; *Champion*, 7.

⁷ *Ordonnances*, x. 501; *Félibien*, iv. 575; *Denifle*, *Chart.* iv. 360, where the king states that Paris has sent more men than all the other towns of France together. It was in vain that proclamations were issued threatening defaulters with the confiscation of their fiefs (*St Denys*, vi. 292).

⁸ *Ordonnances*, x. 502; *Bourgeois*, 120; *St Denys*, vi. 292. As the royal domain in Normandy was offered as part security for the loan, it is not surprising that the scheme aroused bitter mirth in Rouen (*Norm. Chron.* [Williams] 188, [Hellot] 42; *Blondel*, i. 20; *Nagerel*, 172).

⁹ *Denifle*, *Chart.* iv. 356.

¹⁰ *Nov. 24–Dec. 28* (*Itin.* 444; *Denifle*, *Chart.* iv. 357; *Gachard*, 240).

¹¹ *Monstr.* iii. 298; *Le Fèvre*, i. 351; *Itin.* 444.

Rouen's last cry for help, brought by four gentlemen and four *bourgeois*¹.

Meanwhile death stalked in the streets of Rouen. No city could boast more burial-grounds, but they were too few, and the people died faster than they could be buried. Rather than face a lingering death the inhabitants stole out one by one to fall into the hands of the English, who at first would not believe the tales they brought, so stout a show of resistance was still maintained². But this brave front had to be given up, and soon the weak and useless were thrust out by hundreds at a time³. Women with infants in their arms and old men came crying on their knees for pity. The English gave them food, but would not let them pass the lines. They would not, however, be gainsaid until the leisurely discharge of a few shots amongst them sent them thronging back with curses on their own people, who would not let them into the town⁴. For days their only shelter was the ditch, where they lay huddled in the pitiless rain. Many women were overtaken in labour, and their little babes were hoisted up the wall in baskets for their baptism and then sent back to die in nameless horrors⁵. But Christmas was at hand, and Henry could not keep the feast with all this wretchedness before his eyes. He called a truce and sent into the city heralds offering food to all whose stores were done⁶. Any such who would come out should have meat enough for the high feast and safe-conduct to come and go; but the captain would have none of it and barely granted the one day's truce. He did, however, grudgingly allow two English priests and three men with them to carry food to the poor wretches in the ditch, and this gracious stroke of generous policy did much to smooth the way for the coming surrender⁷. Before the end came, however, a last sortie was planned, and a large force provided with food for two days prepared for a desperate attempt to break out. At a given signal 2000 issued from the Porte St Hilaire and flung themselves vainly upon the king's camp. Another body was to attack through the Castle Gate, but the stanchions of the drawbridge had been secretly cut

¹ Monstr. iii. 299.

² J. Page, 19.

³ Ibid. 20; Tit. Liv. 64; Vita, 192; Monstr. iii. 299; Le Fèvre, i. 352; Waurin, ii. 253; Rym. ix. 665.

⁴ J. Page, 20.

⁵ Ibid. 35; Archaeol. xxii. 356; Chron. Ric. II-Hen. VI, 47.

⁶ V. Fréville, 99; J. Page, 21.

⁷ J. Page, 27.

through, and as the mass of men emerged from the gate it gave way and many were precipitated into the moat. Those behind fell back in confusion and raised the cry that it was the captain Guy le Bouteiller who had sawn the stanchions, while the death of his popular colleague the Bastard of Arly completed their discomfiture¹. The morale of the garrison was probably much lowered by this disaster, and ere the year was out hunger broke down the stone walls, and the townsmen had their way. On New Year's Eve a cry went up in the night from every gate in turn². The English gave no answer save on the south, where young Gilbert Umfraville approached the Bridge Gate³ to ascertain what it meant. "Send us a baron or a knight of our stock⁴," was the reply. "I am a knight," said Umfraville, and when they heard his name, the omen encouraged them⁵, and they begged that twelve of them might come out and see the king. Then Umfraville sped in the darkness to the duke of Clarence and the other captains watching the gates. Everywhere his tidings were received with delight. When morning broke he sought the king, whom he found willing to receive the suppliants. The day was spent in conferences between "the states" and Umfraville at the Bridge Gate, and on the morrow at prime four knights, four clerks, and four burgesses⁶, all dressed in black⁷, came forth from the Porte St Hilaire. There they were met by Umfraville and a party of the king's squires and yeomen, who escorted them to the Charterhouse, Umfraville having warned them to make no shrewd speeches and to weigh well what they said, for one unguarded word might wreck all⁸. When they reached the Charterhouse, the king was hearing Mass, and they waited till the service was done. The writer who describes the interview praises Henry for his clemency and grace; but when the Frenchmen fell on their knees before him, there was little graciousness in the scowl with which he haughtily regarded

¹ Monstr. iii. 296 sq.; Le Fèvre, i. 349; Waurin, ii. 254.

² Brut, ii. 404.

³ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 191, (Hellot) 46.

⁴ J. Page, 22.

⁵ *Ibid.* 23; Brut, ii. 404; Strecche, 274. The Umfravilles sprang from Amfreville near St Mère Église in the Cotentin.

⁶ Monstrelet (iii. 304) and Le Fèvre (i. 356) say that there were two of each class and that they made straight for the king's tent but were sent some to the quarters of Archbishop Chichele, some to those of the earl of Warwick.

⁷ J. Page, 28; Tit. Liv. 65.

⁸ "For one worde wrong and owte of warde Myght cause you alle to fare fulle harde." J. Page, 27.

them¹. Still kneeling, they held out to him a bill, which he handed to the duke of Exeter to read. When he found that they petitioned to be heard, he told them to say on. They prayed him for the love of Jesus and the Virgin to have pity on the poor people that lay dying in the ditch; but with unmoved countenance he replied, "Fellows, who put them there? They abode in the city while they might. Let them find that they have sought²." Then he told them that they had kept from him his city and his inheritance, and they answered that they had been charged to keep the city by that king whose born liegemen they were, but that many among them were willing to become his lieges if he would give them leave to go and excuse themselves before the duke of Burgundy. Then Henry's pride broke out. Their French king and their duke of Burgundy knew well enough that he meant to have this city. He had had messages enough from them. No more were wanted, nor should any be sent³. In their despair⁴ the Frenchmen forgot Umfraville's caution, and a knight ventured to say that Rouen with all its people would be a fair city to win. "It is mine," replied the king emphatically, "and I will have it. Let those within prepare themselves, for men shall speak of me till the day of doom⁵." No more was to be said, and with the memory of Caen in their minds, the messengers could only offer up their city and pray that the conqueror would be merciful. At this Henry turned to confer with the duke of Clarence⁶; and, his anger having abated, he gave them time to treat, with a promise that if they did well they might have grace. When they again pleaded for the sufferers in the ditch, he said that upon this matter he would take advice⁷. With that he bade adieu and left them. They walked back to the city with Umfraville, praising on the way the king's looks, demeanour, and wisdom.

What happened in the city is described in French sources, though the story is not contemporary and looks somewhat like an afterthought. The men of Rouen, it is said, would not listen to Henry's terms, but made preparations for setting fire to the

¹ *Archæologia*, xxii. 366.

² J. Page, 30; cf. *Tit. Liv.* 67; *Vita*, 199.

³ J. Page, 31; *Archæol.* xxi. 76.

⁴ *Norm. Chron.* (Williams) 191, (Hellot) 46.

⁵ *Archæol.* xxi. 76; cf. *Tit. Liv.* 67.

⁶ *Basin*, i. 34.

⁷ J. Page, 33; *Monstr.* iii. 304 sq. This account is based mainly on Page, who was of course not present, but seems to be reporting the description of someone who was.

city and making a desperate attempt to break out during the night, whereupon Henry made some concessions in order that he might get the city undamaged¹. However this may be, it is certain that next day two tents were pitched in the duke of Gloucester's camp², and the negotiations began. In the English pavilion were seven commissioners—the earls of Salisbury and Warwick, Lord Fitzhugh, Walter Hungerford, John Robsart, Gilbert Umfraville, and a Portuguese, João de Vasques of Almada³, whose presence is a singular evidence of the intimacy of the relationship between the two countries and a striking recognition of the help rendered by the Portuguese ships in the Seine. The French were represented by the abbot of St George de Boscherville, three clerks (one of them being Master Simon de Rondeman), three knights, three squires, and fourteen others, or twenty-four in all⁴. The bargaining went on for days. The English demanded much, the French offered little⁵, and at length the tents were struck, and the French envoys went sorrowfully back to the town. Here they were met by an infuriated crowd, who threatened to fire the gates and let the English in rather than face the horrors of the siege for another day⁶. On this they mounted the Porte St Hilaire and raised a shout, and when John Robsart approached, they begged him to tell the king that they were ready to give in. The duke of Gloucester and the king conferred, and Archbishop Chichele came down from St Catherine's with an offer to mediate with the clergy in the city. Two tents were again pitched, with a third for the archbishop between them. When

¹ Monstr. iii. 305; Le Fèvre, i. 356; Waurin, ii. 261. A curious tradition about the end of the siege survived among the English. In Rouen, it was said, in accordance with the old Twelfth Night custom each household made its eldest son a king. As the day drew near, the "great heirs of the suburbs" came and begged Henry to allow them to carry out this practice. The king consented, and when the festival came sent for the "kings" that he might see their array. A French knight who was present was reminded of an old prophecy that Rouen should never be won till there should come against it a king with thirty kings in his retinue. Then said the king, "At thy word I will let go the net," and the town surrendered next day (Brut, ii. 598; cf. Kingsford, *First Life*, xlv, xlvi, Lit. 126). If there is anything in the story, the episode must have occurred after negotiations had been opened.

² Norm. Chron. (Williams) 191, (Hellot) 46.

³ Rym. ix. 664. For their commission, dated Jan. 3, 1419, and the safe-conducts of the French envoys, see Bréquigny, 43.

⁴ Rym. ix. 664.

⁵ J. Page, 34, 36, 193. The people of Rouen crowded to the town walls and the English stood about in knots watching the heralds in their blazonry passing with messages from tent to tent (J. Page, 34).

⁶ J. Page, 38.

daylight failed candles and torches were lit, and the talk went on far into the night. For four more days conversations continued, and on Jan. 13 a settlement was at last reached¹. The city was to submit itself wholly to the king's mercy if not relieved by noon on Jan. 19. In case relief should be attempted, no help was to be extended to the rescuers from within the town. If it were not relieved, the town would pay 300,000 crowns and surrender all horses, harness, armour, artillery, powder, and other material of war. All English prisoners would be released. All Normans in the garrison were to be held as prisoners; other soldiers might depart leaving all their possessions. The town should enjoy the privileges² granted to it before the reign of Philip VI, and those citizens who were prepared to take the oath of allegiance to the English king might keep their property. Eighty substantial hostages were given, and messengers were despatched to bear the news to Charles VI and the duke of Burgundy³. The great supplies of food in the English camp were laid open for the needs of the famished city⁴. It had been stipulated that the people in the ditches before the town were to be taken back and fed. The streets were to be cleansed and all dead bodies buried before the English entered⁵. The messenger⁶ who took the news to the French king did not take long to make up his mind as to the possibility of rescue. Before he could reach Beauvais, the duke of Burgundy had left with the king and queen, and he must have had his interview at Beaumont-sur-Oise, where the royal party stayed from Jan. 13 to 15⁷. The duke expressed admiration for the heroism of Rouen, and blamed the dauphin for the fact that he was not strong enough to attempt a rescue; he advised the citizens to capitulate on such terms as they could get⁸. Then, ignoring the protests of deputations from unprotected Paris⁹, he moved further east, and on Jan. 22

¹ The Latin text is in Rymer, ix. 664 sqq. The English text is in Greg., Chron. 122 sqq.

² Rym. ix. 666.

³ J. Page, 40.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 306.

⁵ Rym. ix. 666.

⁶ The Lombard known as Big Jacques (Chéruef, Dom. Ang. i. 35; "graunt Jaket" or "Jakys," J. Page, 14, 41; Archaeol. xxi. 59; cf. Kingsford, Lit. 318).

⁷ Itin. 445; Fenin, 570.

⁸ J. Page, 41; Monstr. iii. 303; Le Fèvre, i. 353; Waurin, ii. 260; cf. Ordonnances, x. 490.

⁹ Denifle, Chart. iv. 359 sq. News of the capitulation of Rouen did not reach Paris till Jan. 17 (Bourgeois, 120, n. 2).

reached Provins, where the party stayed four months, most of the army having already been disbanded¹.

The messenger did not return to Rouen, but sent word that no relief could be expected², and on St Wulfstan's day, Jan. 19, the drama reached its end. The king was seated in great state in the Charterhouse, and Guy le Bouteiller, attended by a group of citizens, kneeled before him and delivered up the keys, which the king handed to the duke of Exeter, who had been appointed captain of the town³. The duke took the keys and rode to his camp at the Porte Beauvoisine. The gate was opened, and as the first party rode in, with horses neighing, banners fluttering, and pipes, clarions, and trumpets blaring, they shouted, "St George," and, "Welcome, Rone, our king's own right!" and a crowd of emaciated Frenchmen answered "Welcome⁴!" It had not been possible to remove all the corpses, and many lay in the streets among the living who cried feebly for bread. The new captain entered the castle and then went the round of the walls and towers, and having set the guard and hoisted the banners of St George, the Queen of Heaven, and the Trinity, he posted strong bodies of men about the town to prevent looting⁵, and made all ready for the king's entry on the following day.

On the morning of Jan. 20⁶ King Henry rode with great ceremony to the Porte Beauvoisine, where he was met by three bishops, seven abbots, and a great throng of lesser clergy bearing relics and crosses. Archbishop Chichele was there with holy water. The king kissed some of the crosses⁷, and then went forward. But as in his passage through London two years before he would have no ostentatious glorification of his own person. No pipe or clarion pealed his victory, and it is remarkable that the writer who describes the scene in greatest detail spends all his eloquence on the king's black horse, with its gold breast-cloth and housings of black damask⁸. Henry rode sadly through the crowded streets, amid the clangour of

¹ Itin. 445, 446; Monstr. iii. 303; Le Fèvre, i. 355; Waurin, ii. 259. [Next day Charles VI wrote to Rheims apologising for the withdrawal (Le Moyen Age, ser. II, xx. 331 sqq.)]

² J. Page, 41.

³ Héron, 78; Twisden, 2291; Paston Lett. i. 10; Usk, 132, 318; Chron. Lond. 107; J. Stone, 19; Kingsford, Chron. 126; Greg., Chron. 127; Three Fifteenth Cent. Chrons. 56; Bodl. MS. 496 (2159), fol. 224. On the same day Walter Beauchamp was set over the *bailliege* of Rouen (D.K.R. xli. 725).

⁴ J. Page, 42 sq.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 68.

⁶ J. Page, 44; Cochon, 281; Bourgeois, 120; Verneuil, 220.

⁷ J. Page, 44.

⁸ Ibid. 45.

bells¹, bringing up the long procession of chanting clergy², and followed by a page bearing a lance with a fox's brush fastened to the end, "whereby some wise men noted many things³," though they might have spared their conjectures had they known that it was merely one of the badges of his family⁴. He alighted at the west door of the cathedral, and the clerks of his chapel went before him up the nave chanting the antiphon "Who is so great a lord⁵?" He knelt in prayer at the high altar and offered thanks to God, and when Mass was done and the offering made, he rode to the castle, where he spent the night⁶.

¹ And, according to Page (44), the cheers of the spectators.

² Norm. Chron. 191; Monstr. iii. 307; Worcester, Itin. 35.

³ Monstr. iii. 307; Le Fèvre, i. 359; Waurin, ii. 263.

⁴ For the fox's brush as one of Henry IV's badges, see Wylie, i. 41, ii. 30 n. It appears also on the frame of the Cassiobury portrait (Macfarlane-Thomson, i. 702).

⁵ Archaeol. xxii. 383.

⁶ J. Page, 45; Monstr. iii. 307; Norm. Chron. 191.

CHAPTER LVIII

ROUEN IN ENGLISH HANDS

THERE is a general tendency among modern French writers to represent the conquests of Henry V as having been made at the expense of an irreconcilable people, who merely submitted sullenly to *force majeure*. This, however, is to ascribe wholly modern sentiments to the French of the fifteenth century. Heroic as the defence of Rouen unquestionably was, its leading motive was not the patriotic zeal which animates the French of to-day. Ever since the establishment of their commune, the life of the burgesses of Rouen had been a long struggle against the pretensions of their archbishops and kings, and now that they had been betrayed in their hour of need, they settled down without a murmur under the sway of a descendant of their ancient dukes. Even when Henry was dead and the national spirit was beginning to awake, there were many Frenchmen who would not join in the denunciations of the English king as a grasping tyrant, and we have the curious statement of a cautious opportunist who could not make up his mind whether he really was a tyrant or after all a just claimant to a title that was sound¹. No such doubts, however, agitated the citizens of Rouen when Henry entered their city. Knowing well what their fate might have been, they welcomed him with gratitude and hailed him not only as duke but as king. Under the treaty of surrender, nine persons had been excluded from the king's mercy. One of them was an Italian, whose subsequent fate does not seem to be known. The others were French—the *bailli* (Guillaume Houdetot), the mayor (Jean Segneult), the archbishop's vicar-general (Robert de Livet), the captain of the crossbowmen (Alain Blanchard), the *bailli* of Valmont, and three unnamed persons, two of whom were fishmongers (*pisceuers*), while the third is called "that person who spoke the foul words²," a reference apparently to some insult shouted

¹ "Ou tyran par crudelité ou juste prosecuteur de son bon et vray titre a Dieu j'en laisse la distinction," Chastellain, ii. 157.

² Rym. ix. 667; cf. Greg., Chron. 127. Tradition added the name of Jean Jourdain, captain of the gunners, but his name does not appear in the official list.

from the walls, which it was justifiable, according to the military etiquette of that time, to wash out in blood. Whether the man of offensive tongue was ever given up we do not know, but of the rest, Houdetot, Segneult, and the fish-mongers saved their necks by money payments and soon fell in with the new regime¹. Robert de Livet was sent to England, where he was long supposed to have died in prison², but recent research among the Chapter records at Rouen proves that by Oct. 11, 1424, he was again in possession of his canonry and that he spent his remaining years in the city³. Alain Blanchard, however, who is charged by English writers with having perpetrated acts of special savagery on such prisoners as fell into his hands⁴, could look for no clemency. Immediately after the king's entry he was brought out and executed⁵. Modern writers usually denounce Henry's action as an indelible stain on his memory: but contemporary authorities lend no countenance to the view that he was actuated by mere wanton vindictiveness—conduct quite inconsistent with his usual policy towards the defenders of a captured town; and it is probable that he really wished to mark his indignation at some gross breach of the laws of honourable warfare⁶.

Many of the defenders of Norman strongholds fell under suspicion of treason, and this blot has besmirched the name of Guy le Bouteiller. It is at least certain that three days after the king's entry he received safe-conduct to go where he liked⁷;

¹ Le Fèvre, i. 358; Waurin, ii. 264; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 211. Segneult actually held the office of King's Advocate at Rouen in 1422 (Chéruel, Dom. Ang. ii. 53).

² Tit. Liv. 64, 68; Vita, 192.

³ Chéruel, Dom. Ang. i. 21, ii. 48, 53; Puiseux, 203.

⁴ Otterbourne, 282; Vita, 200.

⁵ Beheaded, according to Monstrelet (iii. 307); but English writers say that he was hanged (Otterbourne, 282; Tit. Liv. 68, whose "cruci est affixus" is Renaissance affectation for "suspensus est").

⁶ Two centuries later a French writer treated him as a martyr to his patriotism (Serres, i. 994; Perrin, 51). A story grew up that the English offered to let him off with a fine, but he answered that he had nothing to pay with, and even if he had, would not give it to save an Englishman from his dishonour (the story appears in Saint-Foix, iii. 190, written in 1759, and in many later works). In 1825 the story of Blanchard was dramatised and performed with success in both Rouen and Paris, Guy le Bouteiller figuring as the high-born villain; and two years later an effort was made to erect a monument to Blanchard at Rouen (Perrin, 51). But the moment was unpropitious, for a learned loyalist had been looking into the authorities, and finding that a year before the siege Blanchard had murdered the king's representative, he denounced him as "the chief of a band of assassins," and stigmatised the whole legend as "pure invention" and "a lying allegation" (Licquet, 169, 175, 177 sq.). Many writers have since tried to rehabilitate the cult but with little success.

⁷ D.K.R. xli. 707.

within a few weeks he took the oath of allegiance¹; in March he received grants of confiscated lands²; and in April he was receiving the surrender of Normans loyal to Charles VI³. It is no wonder that he was "much blamed and reproached⁴." A contemporary who wrote at the court of the dauphin says that very few of the Norman nobility ever submitted to the conqueror⁵; and though his statement is contradicted by official records⁶, it is true that some nobles suffered confiscation of their lands rather than recognise English rule⁷. Still, the number of knights and squires who submitted was enough for Henry to deem it convenient to summon them to Rouen in two divisions when he wished to communicate to them certain newly enacted ordinances⁸. The clergy were no less amenable. Within two months of the fall of Rouen the king had come to terms with most of the monasteries and other religious foundations of the diocese for the restitution of their property⁹. By the day after the king's entry the incumbents of fifteen parishes to the north had applied to be allowed to come with their parishioners and make their submission¹⁰, and we know of 131 other clergy who submitted before two months were out, special facilities being offered to those who could not travel by reason of infirmity or poverty¹¹. This general compliance met with its reward, for within a year it was decreed¹² that the clergy of the province of Rouen were to remain free from all dues on corn, wine, beer, and other beverages, were not to be required to help in keeping watch and ward or in cleaning and repairing public ditches.

Many Normans of humble birth accepted minor appointments under the English¹³, and a considerable number donned

¹ Monstr. iii. 308; Waurin, ii. 264.

² For grants to him dated March 16, 1419, see Bréquigny, 62; D.K.R. xli. 744; Chéruel, Dom. Ang. i. 78; Lefèvre-Pontalis, lvii. 7.

³ D.K.R. xli. 771.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 308; Fenin, 569.

⁵ Juv. 545.

⁶ For submissions by many knights and squires, Feb. 24-March 20, 1419, see Bréquigny, 56, 58, 60, 62 sq., 216, 217, 218, 219, 220; D.K.R. xli. 743, 759, 765, 767. Cf. "y eut plusieurs Normans qui se rendirent Englez," Fenin, 106.

⁷ On Feb. 9 a proclamation was issued confiscating the lands of laymen and ecclesiastics who had not yet submitted (Bréquigny, 53; D.K.R. xli. 751).

⁸ The first meeting, for those of the new *bailliages* of Upper Normandy, was summoned for Feb. 28, the second, for those of Lower Normandy, for March 7 (Bréquigny, 54; D.K.R. xli. 754).

⁹ Lists appear in Rym. ix. 684; D.K.R. xli. 734, 754, 759.

¹⁰ Ibid. 725.

¹¹ Rym. ix. 672 sqq., 755; D.K.R. xli. 721, 748, 775.

¹² On Jan. 20, 1420 (Rym. ix. 850; D.K.R. xlii. 342).

¹³ For many of these, see Bréquigny, 48 sqq. et passim; D.K.R. xli. 751 sqq.

the St George's cross and joined the English forces in raiding the French¹. As for the citizens of Rouen there is no question of their readiness to accept the lessons of the siege. It was about fifteen days before the mortality began to abate, but in an incredibly short time Rouen had returned to its normal life, a vast multitude of citizens taking the oath without scruple². The day after the king's entry such of the garrison as were not Normans and all who refused to swear allegiance marched out on foot, leaving all their horses, arms, and equipment. They were conducted along the north bank of the river as far as St George's bridge, recently made by the English near Pont de l'Arche. Here every man was searched and deprived of everything save his clothes, two shillings and a staff³. They were then turned adrift. Most went home, but a few reported themselves to the duke of Burgundy at Provins⁴.

The king remained two months at Rouen and at once applied himself to organising the administration both of the town and of the duchy. There is a consensus of evidence that Henry's treatment of the town was conciliatory and that the changed conditions were accepted with equanimity by the inhabitants. Their immediate concern was the payment of the town's enormous ransom. As might have been expected, it proved impossible to collect, and stories issuing from the dauphin's entourage asserted that the citizens were pitilessly pilled and fleeced to meet the king's demands⁵. But the evidence shows that he really exercised great moderation, postponing his claims till the people had had a breathing space. During the negotiations he had insisted that in estimating the indemnity of 300,000 crowns, the crown should be valued at 25 *sous* or shillings. The French representatives urged that it should be reckoned at the customary rate of 20 *sous*, but "by smooth words and promises" they were induced to agree to the English

¹ Monstr. iii. 309.

² Tit. Liv. 69; Vita, 202; Monstr. iii. 309.

³ Ibid. 307 sq.; Le Fèvre, i. 357; Waurin, ii. 262, 264; Juv. 545. J. Page, 41, says that Henry gave each of them a gown; but the truth seems to be that if any had a costly gown, it was taken from him and a poorer one provided in its place. Many of those at the rear of the column dropped their belongings into the river when they learned what was taking place. The valuables confiscated were estimated to be worth 12,000 crowns (Chéruel, Dom. Ang., App. 68).

⁴ Monstr. iii. 307; Le Fèvre, i. 358; Waurin, ii. 264; Fenin, 104. On Feb. 2 the duke of Burgundy gave a dinner to four captains and many "gentilhommes et étrangers nouvellement venus de la garnison de Rouen," Itin. 446.

⁵ Juv. 545; St Denys, vi. 308.

demand, on the understanding, as they vainly pleaded afterwards, that they should really pay at the lower rate¹. The agreement provided that half the amount should be paid when the English entered the town, and the rest a month later. But it at once became obvious that the conditions could not be fulfilled. Six months after the surrender, a large sum was still unpaid², and on July 23 the earl of Warwick and others were commissioned to treat with the citizens for a composition³, and subsequently it was agreed that they should pay an annual sum of 80,000 crowns⁴. It was obvious that many were removing from the town in order to escape their liability⁵, and it was ordered that no one was to be allowed to leave Rouen without a billet for which four *sous* had to be paid⁶. Additional hostages were required to guarantee the payment of the sum annually due, and these were kept in the castle, or at Pont de l'Arche, or in other strong places⁷, though the rigour of their treatment was modified after a few months⁸. Despite all the pressure applied, instalments came in very slowly, and after twelve years more than 40,000 crowns remained unpaid⁹.

One valuable reform introduced at once into his new domains by Henry was the imposition of a uniform standard of weights and measures for the whole of Normandy, instead of the perplexing diversity that had previously prevailed. By a proclamation dated Feb. 15, 1419, he established the Rouen standard for grain, the Arques standard for liquids, the Paris ell as the measure for cloth, and the Troyes mark as the standard of weight¹⁰.

It had been stipulated in the capitulation that the king might take a plot of land, within or without the walls, on which to

¹ "Nous aurions le rabbais," Chérueil, Dom. Ang. ii. 65. [That the English insisted on the higher rate is clear from For. Accts. 69, F.]

² Chérueil, Dom. Ang. ii. 55 sq.

³ Bréquigny, 103.

⁴ Chron. Ric. II—Hen. VI, p. 48.

⁵ Bréquigny, 98; Puiseux, 211.

⁶ Monstr. iii. 309 sq.

⁷ Bréquigny, 112; D.K.R. xii. 809; Puiseux, 202, 214, 303. They numbered 33 (ibid. 209).

⁸ Many of the hostages suffered in health owing to their strict confinement (Bréquigny, 112). Their deaths would of course have defeated the purpose for which they had been imprisoned, and on Nov. 19, 1419, an order was issued that all except those at Pont de l'Arche should be allowed to return to Rouen, there to remain prisoners in their own homes during the king's pleasure, other citizens going bail for them (D.K.R. xli. 809).

⁹ i.e. 40,817 on Nov. 7, 1430 (Farin, i. 147; Chérueil, Dom. Ang. ii. 70; Puiseux, 189, 208, 213).

¹⁰ Rym. ix. 691; Bréquigny, 54.

build a palace, provided that he should compensate the dispossessed owner¹. He accordingly purchased a site on the waterside, just within the walls at the south-west corner of the city². Here he built a strong fortress³. It was designed by Jeanson Salvart, the cathedral architect⁴, and was to have been completed in eighteen months⁵, a large number of carpenters, sawyers, and other workmen being brought from England to assist in the work⁶. In 1444, however, it was still unfinished⁷, and in 1447 Salvart died⁸. It had nevertheless a long history. Henry V had intended it to be a safe residence, which might defy any rising in the city; he constructed a covered way connecting it with the castle⁹, and long after the latter was in ruins, it was the strongest place in Rouen¹⁰. In addition, Henry rebuilt the barbican at the southern end of the bridge¹¹, transforming it into a rectangular fort flanked by four towers¹², henceforth known as the Little Castle¹³.

Owing to the excellent commissariat of the English, their losses during the siege were slight compared with those of the French. Nevertheless a number of important men perished. Among these were the prior of Kilmainham¹⁴, Gilbert Talbot¹⁵,

¹ Rym. ix. 665, 714; Farin, i. 100, 103.

² Tit. Liv. 68; Archaeol. xxii. 378; Chérueil, i. 67; [For. Accts. 69, I]. On March 13, 1419, he paid 2630 livres for it (Deville, Revue, 28). The site is now occupied by the Place Henri IV, the rue St Jacques, the rue d'Harcourt, and the rue de la Seine (Normandie Monumentale, 9).

³ It was known at first as the Royal or New Palace (Masseville, iv. 383; Jolimont, 2; Puiseux, 219; Lefèvre-Pontalis, lvii. 15; Vita, 200), but after the present Palais de Justice was built, in 1499, it was called the Old Palace (C. Beaurepaire, Notes, 23; Zeiler, pt. viii. 22; Grisel, B. 65).

⁴ Rym. ix. 745; Deville, Rev. 30; Bréquigny, 169. He had been appointed master-mason at the cathedral in 1398 (Deville, Rev. 36), and "conducteur des travaux" in 1406 (Lefèvre-Pontalis, lvii. 13, 47). He was afterwards "Maître de Maçonnerie" of the castle and the city (ibid. 16; cf. Deville, Revue, 31).

⁵ J. Page, 40.

⁶ Iss. Roll 7 Hen. V, Mich., Oct. 2, Nov. 13, 16, 20, 1419, Feb. 22, 1420.

⁷ Farin, i. 101.

⁸ Deville, Revue, 33; Richard, 51.

⁹ Puiseux, 220; Holinshed, iii. 568; Stow, Chron. 357.

¹⁰ It was destroyed in 1793, and no trace of it remains. There is a picture of it in a charter of Rouen dated 1458 (Chérueil, App. i. 1) and in a fifteenth-century window in the church of St Jean (Revue de Rouen, 1833, i. 112), besides a number of later ones.

¹¹ Vita, 204; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 48; Cochon, 344; Chérueil, 69; Puiseux, 218; Farin, i. 100; Duranville, 174.

¹² Puiseux, 3.

¹³ It was demolished in 1779 (Duranville, 80; Jolimont, 8).

¹⁴ Four Masters, iv. 841; O'Flanagan, i. 80; Kingsford, Lit. 289.

¹⁵ J. Page, 7. The king ordered 2000 Masses to be said for his soul as well as for that of Edward Holland (Devon, 357, Oct. 22, 1418).

and Edward Holland, count of Mortain¹. Talbot's death caused a vacancy in the order of the Garter, in which there were at the time three other gaps—one occasioned by the death of the count of Holland in 1417, the second by that of Richard Lord Grey of Codnor on Aug. 1, 1418², and the third by that of John Blount³, killed in single combat at Rouen as described above.

¹ His death occurred between Oct. 6 and 22 (D.K.R. xli. 717; Devon, 357). Cf. J. Page, 8.

² Inq. post mort. iv. 33; G.E.C. (ed. Gibbs), vi. 129; Beltz, clviii; Kingsford, Lit. 289.

³ He had succeeded to the stall of the earl of Oxford on Feb. 15, 1417 (Beltz, clviii).

CHAPTER LIX

FURTHER BARGAINING

WHEN the envoys from Rouen spoke of communicating with the duke of Burgundy before they could surrender, Henry replied that the duke already knew all that he needed to know, for messengers had often passed between them during the siege¹. It will be remembered, however, that before the siege began, Henry had been forced to recognise the duke as an enemy, and it was not long before the Armagnac party took advantage of the new position. On Sept. 18, 1418, Guillaume de Baus, master of the household to the dauphin, had been sent from Niort to confer with the duke of Clarence before Rouen², and on Oct. 3 he was granted a safe-conduct for an interview with the king³. Eleven days later further safe-conducts were made out for the archbishop of Tours (Jacques Gelu) and Jean de Norry, with other representatives of the dauphin, who were prepared to treat for peace and an alliance with England⁴. On Oct. 26 fourteen exalted personages were appointed to confer with them on the English side⁵.

An important document still extant⁶ shows that at this particular moment these overtures from the dauphin were very welcome to Henry. He saw that his hold on his conquests was insecure. No single lord of any consequence had come over to him, while the land was full of "brigands" who attacked such people as had submitted to the English. If no terms were made, he would have to go further and further on his career of conquest, while if he concentrated on the defence of Normandy—the soundest policy—he would have to pay his troops regularly, whereas he was depending upon plunder to keep

¹ J. Page, 31.

² Beaucourt, i. 283.

³ Rym. ix. 624.

⁴ Bréquigny, 209; D.K.R. xli. 701; Beaucourt, i. 283. A secretary of the duchess of Anjou, Guiot de Pressy, was granted a safe-conduct on the same day (Rym., loc. cit.; D.K.R. xli. 699). He was again with Henry on Dec. 15, when he received a safe-conduct to go back to the duchess of Anjou and to return (Rym. ix. 659; D.K.R. xli. 704).

⁵ Rym. ix. 626; D.K.R. xli. 701. Their number was afterwards reduced to seven.

⁶ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 350 sqq.

down their demands¹. His envoys were therefore instructed² to treat for a marriage between himself and the French king's daughter Catherine, and to ascertain what dowry she would bring. It was to be understood that Normandy must not be a subject of bargaining; any offer of territory on the part of the French must refer to lands not yet in Henry's possession. In effect he would be satisfied with nothing less than the terms of the treaty of Brétigny, together with the cession of Flanders and the coast between Gravelines and the Somme. Even if such an offer were made, it would be doubtful whether the dauphin was strong enough to give effect to it. A truce therefore would be more acceptable than a so-called peace; and seeing that during a truce Henry would suspend his claim to the French crown, the other side ought to give him something substantial in return. As to the duke of Burgundy (with whom he had no alliance), though his party seemed to be the strongest power in France, yet with God's help Henry would shake his authority in one day, believing as he did that he was almost impotent in Paris. And lastly, if the dauphin should agree to Henry's demands, the English envoys were to ask how and when the unconquered parts should be handed over. Moreover, should an alliance be formed and English troops be used to break the power of the Burgundians, would the English be allowed to have Flanders, Artois, and the Boulonnais (or at least St Omer) in full sovereignty for their pains? A separate truce had just been concluded with the young count of Armagnac³ and the lord of Albret⁴, who had given an undertaking that they would submit to King Henry even though these negotiations should come to nothing⁵; and it was expressly arranged that their representatives should not be allowed to take part, though they were to be honourably treated and induced if possible to further the king's views. Armed with these instructions seven English envoys⁶ proceeded to Alençon, where on Nov. 10 they were met by six representa-

¹ Cf. A. Collins, viii. 106, which shows that some of the captains who left England in August, 1417, had received no pay on June 29 of the next year.

² Rym. ix. 626 sqq.

³ See above, p. 83.

⁴ For the form of homage of the "lord of Labret," Sept. 23, 1418, see Harl. MS. 4763, ff. 151-152; Cotton MS. Tiberius, B xii, f. 119 b.

⁵ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 352.

⁶ The earl of Salisbury, Lord Grey, Walter Hungerford, Philip Morgan, Roland Lenthall, William Alington, and Master John Stokes (Rym. ix. 632).

tives of the dauphin¹, headed by Jean de Norry. Others of the deputation were Robert de Braquemont, ex-admiral of France, and Louis de Chalon, who had just been dispossessed of his county of Tonnerre by the duke of Burgundy². No special representatives of the duchess of Anjou seem to have been included.

An extremely curious report of the proceedings has been preserved³. For a while, it is stated, both sides sat perfectly silent. At length Master Philip Morgan introduced himself and his colleagues by name, and begged the French to be good enough to state what they had to propose. Thereupon they withdrew for a while, and when they came back much time was spent in discussing whether they should converse in Latin or another tongue. Then, credentials having been verified, the English withdrew to arrange what should be done next; and on their return Morgan said that he gathered that the dauphin was inclined for peace and he would be glad to hear his intentions. The French asked for time, and it was agreed to adjourn till next morning.

When the proceedings were resumed, Morgan, after another long silence, urged that as the dauphin had been the first to open negotiations, it was only reasonable that his representatives should begin by making some definite proposal. Again the other side withdrew, and on their return Jean de Norry, speaking in French, disclaimed any special desire for peace on the part of the dauphin, who had merely sent to Henry on hearing that he was willing to treat. Surely then the first proposal should come from the English king. Next the English urged that all speeches should be in Latin, and after more deliberation apart, there followed a further altercation as to who should begin. At length, however, the French produced a written statement, in which they offered to give up Saintonge, Agenais, Périgord, the Limousin, Angoumois, Rouergue, and Poitou, but were silent as to Touraine, Maine, Anjou, and Lower Normandy, which was already in Henry's possession. The English envoys had no hesitation in replying that the offer was altogether insufficient; much more had been offered when the French lords wanted help against the duke of

¹ "Une bien notable ambassade," Juv. 545. For their instructions dated at Chinon, Nov. 2, see Tillet, *Recueil*, 124 b, 125.

² Rym. ix. 633; Beaucourt, *Meurtre*, 425.

³ Rym. ix. 632 sqq.; cf. D.K.R. xlv. 319.

Burgundy in 1412¹. The French dilated upon the immense size of the territory they were willing to cede—a district as large as Aragon or Navarre—to which the English answered that it mattered not how large it was; what they looked to was its size compared with that of the rest of France, and if this were regarded it was insufficient and small. After this they separated for the night.

Next day began with the usual silence, the rest of the morning being spent in arranging in what order the different parts of the question should be approached. That afternoon and the whole of the following day were wasted in fruitless talk. The morning session of the 14th opened with the usual sulky silence till at length Jean de Norry rose, apparently with something new to say. But first he wanted an assurance that Henry really wished to ally with the dauphin and help him to put down his enemies, to which the English circumspectly replied that they could not deal with that until they knew more about the "offer." The deadlock was again got over by the skill of Philip Morgan, Norry agreeing to proceed on receiving an assurance that what he was about to say would be kept a profound secret. He then added to the previous offer all Upper Normandy north of the Seine, except the city and *bailliage* of Rouen, and promised that if the united forces should capture Artois and Flanders, the English should have a share of the winnings. After having the terms put down in writing the English party rejected them as one-sided and inadequate. Next day the French made another offer. If they might keep Poitou and Saintonge, they would let Henry have an equivalent amount of land in Normandy. Norry had spoken in French and "somewhat diffusely," and the English, not being sure whether they had correctly understood him, asked if the offer was identical with the treaty of Brétigny, and he said that it was. The proposal having been written down was debated till nightfall, but next day the English, having looked carefully into the terms, pointed out that they did not correspond at all to the treaty. Norry excused himself lamely on the ground that he had not been quite sure of the boundaries defined in the treaty, and suggested modifications of his proposals to the accompaniment of running criticisms from the English. At length Morgan asked if by "holding"

¹ Rym. ix. 641; Wylie, iv. 69.

the lands, the French meant holding as a vassal or in full sovereignty. Next day, when an answer was to be given, Norry said that this question was so difficult that they had better deal with some of the other points first; he supposed, however, that the English king, being a just and conscientious man, did not wish to hold the provinces concerned differently from his forbears. Morgan pointed out that Henry was rightful king of France—a title never claimed by the earlier dukes of Normandy; in France therefore he would recognise no overlord but God; nor would he accept as part of a bargain what he had in his power already. The French could only say that on the question of vassalage they had no instructions; but no doubt if a personal meeting could be arranged between the dauphin and the English king, the matter could be settled. It was, however, answered that such a meeting would be useless until preliminaries had been fully discussed; whereupon the French urged that the English should say what sort of offer they were looking for. Then followed more idle conversation, and proceedings were adjourned for several days, till Nov. 21. In the interval the English were approached by the two agents who had first opened negotiations at Rouen; these said that the French spokesmen really had further powers which they had not divulged. This statement did not make for mutual confidence, nor were prospects improved when Norry, on the resumption of discussion, likened the English envoys to the devil¹. Nevertheless, he now declared that he offered all the concessions of the treaty of Brétigny, after which the English suggested that to prevent subsequent misunderstanding it would be well to discuss in detail what the terms of the "Great Peace" exactly implied. The ensuing debate, however, only emphasised the fact that no agreement was possible unless the dauphin would hand over the ceded lands in full sovereignty. The French again said that they lacked instructions on this point; the English reiterated their king's claim to the throne, hinted that he might abate his demands if the negotiations went on, but declared that in any case the French must give him complete lordship over Touraine, Anjou, Maine, and Flanders, together with the lordships of Beaufort and Nogent². The French begged

¹ "Nos temptantes Insidiatoris more," Rym. ix. 640.

² On Beaufort, now Montmorency (Aube), and Nogent, i.e. Nogent l'Artaud (Aisne), see above, i. 420.

that something more reasonable might be put forward; whereupon Morgan asserted that their master had offered still more some time ago, as he could prove in writing, and that after all the English king was only asking for what his predecessors had. Thereupon all got out of their seats, and talked and talked till the English managed to put the question: Supposing the negotiations continued, would the French try to induce their side to accept Henry's terms? The reply was that they could not go a step further than they had done. Following his instructions, Morgan put one more point: Supposing an agreement were after all arranged, what steps would the dauphin take to have it carried out? The answer was that the lands in question belonged to the dauphin, and he could do what he liked with them. But the English rejoined that the dauphin was still under age, that he might revoke everything afterwards on the ground that his father was the real king, that most of the French nobility were against him, and that even if he really were regent, the king could cancel his appointment at any time. The French then spent some time trying to prove that the principal nobles, except of course the duke of Burgundy, were on the dauphin's side. Then, as though despairing of a successful issue, Morgan called Heaven and Earth to witness that the bloodshed that must follow would be on the dauphin's head, but ended feebly by asking if there were anything else on which the French were authorised to speak. They replied that they had instructions regarding the suggested marriage between King Henry and the princess Catherine, but as the larger matter had broken down, they preferred now not to enter upon the smaller one. Moreover, the term specified on their safe-conducts would expire in six days and they must depart. Nevertheless they met once again on the next day, when Morgan said that experience had now taught them what the French really meant. They might rest assured that such proposals as they had been putting forward would never lead to peace. Still, the Frenchmen would not give up hope. Why should there not be a short truce to last (say) till Candlemas? "Put your suggestions in writing," said Morgan; but unless they had something better to say than what he had just heard, it was virtually certain that nothing would come of it. Thereupon the Frenchmen rose and abruptly took their leave.

The curious report just summarised is signed by a notary,

Richard Cowdray, who afterwards became clerk to the king's Council. If it were not for the king's own statement that the English envoys had full powers¹, we should be inclined to look upon the proceedings at Alençon as informal preliminaries rather than a serious attempt to conclude a definitive peace. At any rate the whole of the original fourteen envoys were still treated as if they were the only authorised spokesmen for England, and while the altercations at Alençon were in progress an additional paper of instructions, dated Nov. 14, was sent to them².

In all probability Henry did not regard these negotiations very seriously. For on Oct. 26—the very day when he gave his careful instructions to the Alençon envoys—he wrote to the duke of Burgundy³ offering to give a fair hearing to any reasonable terms he might propose. On Nov. 1 the duke returned a reply asking for safe-conducts for nine envoys who would discuss a settlement. The safe-conducts were issued on Nov. 3⁴, and by Nov. 17⁵ eight envoys were accredited to negotiate for peace with the king of England on behalf of the duke of Burgundy. The embassy was headed by Bernard de Chevenon, bishop of Beauvais, who was authorised to speak in the name of the king of France, and was accompanied by Cardinal Orsini⁶, who was still trying to mediate. The English were represented by Archbishop Chichele, Bishop Langley the chancellor, the earl of Warwick, and others, including Hungerford, Morgan, and Stokes, who had been at Alençon⁷. The conference opened at Pont de l'Arche at the beginning of December⁸. From the outset the old trifling again appeared. The French wanted to use their own tongue instead of Latin, and though Cardinal Orsini wrote to Henry bringing his personal influence to bear, the king took a serious view of the demand, and in a letter of Dec. 4 urged the cardinal to dissuade the French from pressing this “unwonted thing⁹.” Latin was the universal diplomatic language, while neither he, his council, nor his envoys could properly write, understand, or

¹ “Rationabiliter et plenarie instructos,” Rym. ix. 651.

² Ibid. 646 sq.

³ Ibid. 631; Beaucourt, i. 293.

⁴ Rym. ix. 632; D.K.R. xli. 702.

⁵ Rym. ix. 648.

⁶ Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 362.

⁷ Rym. ix. 654; Cordeliers, 205; Monstr. iii. 295, 445; Norm. Chron. (Williams) 189, (Hellot) 44.

⁸ Rym. ix. 654 sq.

⁹ Ibid. 655 sq.

speak French¹. Days were consumed over this academical dispute, and on Dec. 9 the cardinal went in person to St Catherine's abbey, and had a four hours' conversation with Henry². They discussed the language question and the extension of the safe-conducts, which would soon expire; but the king would not agree to treat for peace until the New Year had opened, hoping that by then Rouen would have fallen. On the language dispute, seeing the cardinal still inclined to support the French, he gave way so far as to agree that the French envoys might speak French, provided that his might speak English and that all proposals when reduced to writing should be accompanied by a Latin translation. The cardinal had brought with him a picture of the princess Catherine. It was painted from life³, and Henry liked it very much⁴. But he had asked for 1,000,000 gold crowns⁵ as a dowry, together with Normandy, Aquitaine, Ponthieu and other lordships named in the treaty of Brétigny, and with regard to this he was in no mood for discussion⁶. It was growing dark when the conversation drew to a close, and as Henry asked the cardinal not to leave that night, Orsini sent off a message announcing what had occurred, and requesting the French envoys to let him have their decision by eleven o'clock next morning. The message was delivered at Pont de l'Arche at two in the morning of Dec. 10. The envoys were called together at daybreak, and at once accepted the conditions as to language; with regard to the dowry, however, they asked for an extension of time, for the duke of Burgundy could not take the responsibility of agreeing to the demands respecting the king's inheritance⁷. They withdrew to Pontoise to explain the state of affairs to the king, the queen, and the duke⁸, while the cardinal, who seems to have been anxious to go home, returned at once to Italy to report his failure to the pope⁹.

Henry has been credited with "an astute diplomacy which kept the French divided while Rouen perished¹⁰," and modern writers alternate between admiration of his skill and condemnation of his duplicity. But the truth apparently is that both

¹ "Qui Gallicam scribere nesciunt intelligere penitus neque loqui," Rym. ix. 656.

² Ibid. 657, 659.

³ Waurin, ii. 252.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 295; Le Fèvre, i. 348.

⁵ Ibid.; Waurin, ii. 252.

⁶ Monstr. iii. 295 sq.

⁷ Rym. ix. 657; Monstr. iii. 296.

⁸ Ibid.; Waurin, ii. 258.

⁹ Monstr. iii. 296.

¹⁰ Kingsford, 249.

Armagnacs and Burgundians were bidding strongly against each other for English help, and Henry was willing to grant it to whichever of them was the readier to accept his terms.

The fall of Rouen caused a renewed eagerness for Henry's friendship. During the siege, indeed, a safe-conduct had been issued for the duke of Brittany¹; on Jan. 12, 1419², the truce with him was prolonged till Nov. 1; a further safe-conduct for him was issued on Feb. 12³, and on March 5 he came to Rouen with 500 horsemen, was received with special magnificence⁴, and after much friendly converse arranged for the prolongation of the truce in an amended form till Christmas⁵, with the understanding, it is said, that even after that date neither party should make war on the other except after six months' notice⁶. While he was at Rouen the duke despatched messengers both to the dauphin at Montargis and to King Charles and the duke of Burgundy at Provins, so that there can be no doubt that all those interested were kept informed of what was occurring⁷. The duke returned through Caen and Bayeux, and was at Dol by March 28⁸. He left at Rouen Henri du Juch to act as intermediary in any further dealings⁹, and probably intended to make another visit to Rouen soon afterwards¹⁰. The course of events, however, led him to change his purpose.

About the same time the duchess of Anjou was likewise bargaining for an extension of the truce which protected her lands from attack. Envoys from her were at Rouen early in February, and by the 15th had secured a prolongation of the agreement to the Octaves of Easter¹¹. The count of Armagnac and the lord of Albret were also resolved to cling to English help. On Feb. 15 the truce with them was prolonged from Easter to the ensuing midsummer, and safe-conducts were issued for these great Gascon lords to go where they would in "France or Normandy¹²."

Such dealings with the invader indicate the complete collapse of all Armagnac resistance and the utter feebleness of the party.

¹ Bréquigny, 210; D.K.R. xli. 703.

² Rym. ix. 663; Morice, i. 468, ii. 976.

³ Rym. ix. 688.

⁴ Tit. Liv. 71; Vita, 206.

⁵ Bréquigny, 251.

⁶ Tit. Liv. 71; Vita, 207.

⁷ Morice, i. 468; Lobineau, i. 536, ii. 930; Blanchard, no. 1344.

⁸ Morice, ii. 981; Lobineau, i. 536, ii. 930, 931, 936.

⁹ Ibid. ii. 930.

¹⁰ A safe-conduct for him was made out on April 11 (Rym. ix. 729 sq.; D.K.R. xli. 769).

¹¹ Rym. ix. 675, 692; D.K.R. xli. 722, 751.

¹² Rym. ix. 661, 690, 695; D.K.R. xli. 727.

The failure of recent negotiations did not prevent the dauphin from renewing his effort to reach an understanding with the English. The suggestion of a personal interview between him and Henry, put forward by his envoys at Alençon, had already been made by him in a letter to the English king written on Nov. 15, 1418¹, and received on Nov. 24. In his reply, dated Nov. 25, Henry said that no such meeting could be considered till Rouen was in his hands, and if it ever did take place, he would expect something different from the paltry offers that had just been made at Alençon². By Christmas, however, arrangements for a renewal of the negotiations were well advanced, and on Jan. 1, the day when Rouen began to treat for surrender, permits were issued for the dauphin's emissaries to come to Louviers³. On the 15th, however, they were granted safe-conducts for a visit to Rouen⁴, and on Jan. 21, Archbishop Chichele, Bishops Ware and Beaufort, Walter Hungerford, John Kemp, and Richard Cowdray were commissioned to treat with them for a final peace⁵. Various interviews took place in the church of the Black Friars, and on Feb. 12⁶ it was agreed that a personal meeting between Henry and the dauphin should take place on Mid-Lent Sunday, March 26; before then the English envoys would be at Évreux and the French envoys at Dreux to make final arrangements for the interview at some place midway between the two⁷. In the meantime an armistice was arranged for the whole of the country between the Seine and the Loire. It was to last till April 23, and the necessary officers were appointed to deal with infractions of its terms⁸. On March 9 Archbishop Chichele and

¹ Rym. ix. 647; Beaucourt, i. 291; Delaville-Leroux, *Domination Bourguignonne*, 201.

² Rym. ix. 651.

³ Bréquigny, 213; D.K.R. xli. 705. For the instructions of these envoys, dated Dec. 26, 1418, see Tillet, *Recueil*, 125.

⁴ Bréquigny, 214; D.K.R. xli. 707.

⁵ Rym. ix. 670, 687, 704; cf. D.K.R. xli. 741. Beaufort's name, however, does not appear in the subsequent negotiations.

⁶ On Jan. 31 the safe-conducts had been extended for a fortnight. The French envoys at that date were Jean de Norry, the count of Tonnerre, Guillaume Seignet, knight, Jean de Vailly, president of the *Parlement* of Tours, Jean Tudert, dean of Notre Dame, Paris, and Jean de Villebreme, one of the dauphin's secretaries (Rym. ix. 676).

⁷ *Ibid.* 686, 687, 701, 788; D.K.R. xli. 738; *Orig. Lett.*, Ser. 11, i. 77; *Brit. Mus. Add. MS.* 24,062, f. 194; Beaucourt, i. 294. [The English bishops were instructed by Chichele to have prayers offered for the success of the conference (*Reg. Hereford*, 63 sq.).]

⁸ Rym. ix. 692; D.K.R. xli. 731, 732.

Bishop Beaufort were authorised to issue passes for the dauphin's envoys¹, and King Henry arrived at Évreux on the 25th². But there was no dauphin at Dreux; in fact no meeting-place had been fixed³; and all the plans for the interview melted away. In the first week of April the English court moved on to Vernon, where the king remained quietly in the castle till nearly the end of May⁴.

The English chroniclers cry out upon the faithlessness and treachery of the dauphin⁵, and an interesting private letter, written by an English soldier at Évreux on April 3⁶, takes the view that the king had been fooled, denounces "all the ambassadors that we deal with" as "double and false," and gloomily opines that there is now no prospect of peace. Though Henry afterwards made much diplomatic use of the dauphin's breach of faith, he could afford to regard it with equanimity, for he was already deep in another intrigue with the duke of Burgundy.

¹ Rym. ix. 704; D.K.R. xli. 740. They received instructions from the dauphin on March 6 (Fillet, Recueil, 125).

² Rym. ix. 714.

³ Ibid. 788; Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 24,062, f. 194; Tit. Liv. 71; Vita, 208.

⁴ For documents dated at Vernon from April 5–May 26, see Rym. ix. 727 sq.; D.K.R. xli. 762 sqq.; Bréquigny, 68 sqq.

⁵ e.g. Tit. Liv. 71; Vita, 209.

⁶ Orig. Lett., Ser. II, i. 76. The writer signs himself "T. F.," but his identity is unknown.

CHAPTER LX

THE CONFERENCE OF MEULAN

JUST as the dauphin refused to accept the failure at Alençon as final, so the duke of Burgundy did not allow the fruitlessness of the conference at Pont de l'Arche to discourage him. Even before Rouen fell envoys of his were on their way for an audience at St Catherine's¹. On Feb. 14 it was known that ambassadors were coming from the king of France², and on Feb. 23 the earl of Warwick, John Grey, and Masters John Kemp and John Stafford were commissioned to confer with them³. The French envoys—the duke of Brittany, Jean de Vergy, Regnier Pot, and six others—were appointed at Provins on Feb. 26⁴; safe-conducts for them, except the duke, were issued on March 18⁵; and after meetings at Mantes without the duke, the two parties held at Rouen several discussions in which he took part⁶. The details of the negotiations were kept a profound secret at the time⁷, but we know all about them now. The English pressed for the lands ceded by the treaty of Brétigny, the duchy of Normandy, and whatever else they held in France, all in full sovereignty⁸; and the French agreed to submit this demand to the duke. The result was that at Mantes, on March 30, three French commissioners offered to yield the lands in question, though they said nothing as to the terms on which they were to be held, and declared their willingness to treat further for a permanent peace and a marriage alliance, it being understood that Henry was prepared to modify his claim to the crown⁹. On April 7 representatives of the two sides met again at Vernon, whither Henry had transferred his quarters, and agreed that the English king should meet the king and queen of France and the duke of Burgundy on May 15 at some place between Mantes and Pontoise, the princess Catherine being present. In the meanwhile a truce was to be observed

¹ D.K.R. xli. 705.

³ Ibid. 696 sqq.

⁵ Ibid. 709.

⁷ St Denys, vi. 314.

⁹ Ibid. 723; Bréquigny, 251.

² Rym. ix. 689.

⁴ Ibid. 722.

⁶ Ibid. 722.

⁸ Rym. ix. 723, 789.

in all the region between the Seine and the Somme and up to the walls of Calais, as well as in that part of the country between the Seine and the Loire that was actually in the obedience of the duke of Burgundy. But the benefits of the truce were not to apply to places in Normandy which had not yet submitted, to other towns then being besieged, or to persons of the Armagnac party¹.

These preliminaries—for they were no more—having been settled, the earl of Warwick and other commissioners were despatched with an armed escort to interview the duke of Burgundy at Provins². The Armagnacs were roaming with little check over the country north and east of Paris, and at Charmes the party was ambushed by Tanneguy du Chastel, the assailants, however, being beaten off with a loss of forty killed³. On April 10 Warwick reached Provins⁴; next day he was entertained at supper by the duke⁵; but he soon returned to Vernon, whence, with a further commission dated April 22, he went to Troyes, whither the king and queen had gone for Easter⁶. At Troyes on April 18 Charles had issued a document making arrangements for the truce agreed upon at Vernon⁷. Warwick and his fellows were authorised to take sureties, to make final arrangements for the coming meeting, and to settle details as to dowry in view of a possible marriage of Henry and the princess Catherine⁸. May 15 had been fixed as the date of the interview between the kings, but on May 6 three French envoys asked for a postponement on account of the sickness of Charles. Henry consented, and the date was altered to May 30⁹.

On May 9 the commissioners decided that the meeting should take place in a large field¹⁰ just outside the west gate of Meulan¹¹. The spot is minutely defined in the official document

¹ Rym. ix. 723 sqq. Gisors, though not yet conquered, was to enjoy the advantages of the truce.

² Ibid. 721, 726.

³ Brut, ii. 560; Chron. Ric. II—Hen. VI, 48; Monstr. iii. 313; Waurin, ii. 266.

⁴ Tit. Liv. 73; Vita, 213.

⁵ Gachard, 240.

⁶ Rym. ix. 734; Monstr. iii. 318; Waurin, ii. 266; Boutiot, ii. 392.

⁷ Rym. ix. 733.

⁸ Ibid. 734; D.K.R. 774, 780; Bréquigny, 252; Tit. Liv. 73; Vita, 216.

⁹ Rym. ix. 746 sq., 749, 750, 752; D.K.R. 774, 783; Félibien, ii. 797.

¹⁰ Called "La Chat" in Rym. ix. 752. This probably means L'Achat, i.e. something purchased.

¹¹ Rym. ix. 753, 759; Tit. Liv. 73; Vita, 216; Monstr. iii. 318 sq.; Le Fèvre, i. 360; St Denis, vi. 326; Brut, ii. 560; Chron. Ric. II—Hen. VI, 49.

as lying opposite an island in the Seine¹, with the river for its boundary on the south, a marsh on the north, a stream bisecting it from north to south, and the road that entered the town by the *Porte de Meulan* traversing it from west to east². The whole space was to be enclosed with wooden palisades, while sharp stakes were to be driven into the river bed from the ends of the palisade to the island. Across the enclosed area two trenches were to be dug, dividing it into three parts, of which the one nearest Meulan was to be for the French, the one farthest away for the English. Each nation was to keep to its own ground, which would be trenched and paled like a separate camp, the only difference between the two being that on the side facing the centre the English fence was only one foot high, while that of the French was much higher in order to serve as a protection in case of an attack by the English archers, a danger from which the English were free, as the French had no long bows³. Neither side was to bring more than 1500 armed men⁴. The middle space was reserved for the negotiators, and was entered by three fenced passages from either side, each guarded by fifty soldiers, and when on the opening day of the proceedings a foolhardy Englishman, wishing to show off, jumped into the forbidden area, he was promptly gibbeted by order of the marshal. It was also proclaimed that any man would be beheaded if he used offensive words, or tried to seize another for debt or breach of faith, or started wrestling or putting the stone, or doing anything that might tend to uproar⁵. In the middle of the field there were two tents where the monarchs could confer apart with their counsellors, and at the very centre, thirty-six measured feet from each tent, draped with gold cloth and rich hangings embroidered with lilies and leopards, and enclosed within a further palisade, was the pavilion where the meeting was actually to take place⁶.

It was probably on May 26 that Henry moved out from Vernon

¹ i.e. the *Isle Belle*.

² The site is now covered by the suburb of *Hardicourt*, but the features mentioned may be readily identified.

³ *Rym.* ix. 752; *Monstr.* iii. 319; *Le Fèvre*, i. 360; *Waurin*, ii. 267; *Gesta*, 136 n.; *Juv.* 550.

⁴ *Juv.* 549. Other figures are given by other writers.

⁵ *Ibid.* 550; *Tit. Liv.* 74; *Vita*, 218.

⁶ *St Denys*, vi. 326; *Kingsford*, *Lit.* 333; *Tit. Liv.* 73; *Juv.* 549 sq.; *Monstr.* iii. 319 sq.

and took up his quarters at Mantes¹, which had long since submitted to the duke of Clarence, the leading townsmen having come out to meet him and hand over the keys at the news of his approach². On the same day the king of France, Queen Isabel, and the duke of Burgundy left Provins, reaching Pontoise on the evening of May 28³. Meantime the field at Meulan was busy with preparations. The English portion was full of tents⁴ bright with gold lilies, leopards, and other gay devices, while at the other end the French had made their camp like a town, with streets and passages between the lines⁵. On May 29 representatives of each side received from the principals an oath that there should be no underhand dealing at the meeting⁶. Next day⁷ Henry was early on the field accompanied by his two brothers, the duke of Exeter, the earl of Warwick, and many other notables. At two o'clock loud trumpeting and minstrelsy announced the arrival of Queen Isabel in a rich litter, accompanied by her damsels and attended by the duke of Burgundy. Charles VI could not appear, for he was suffering from one of his periodical fits of frenzy⁸. When the queen had alighted, the earl of Warwick was sent to inform her of the order of the day's proceedings. From each side sixty lords and knights and sixteen councillors were to be admitted to the deliberations. When their names had been called and verified⁹, a signal was given, and Queen Isabel and King Henry left their tents at the same moment, and preceded by their counsellors in procession two by two, walked slowly to a spot marked with a stake. Here Henry kissed the queen's hand, while the duke of Burgundy bowed his head and slightly crooked his knee as the king embraced him. Henry then led the queen into the central pavilion, where two thrones were set up about twelve feet apart. When both were seated, the earl of Warwick, speaking in French, explained to the queen the purpose of the meeting. Little else was done that day, and though the proceedings lasted

¹ For documents dated at Mantes, May 26–Aug. 5, 1419, see D.K.R. xli. 775 sqq., 786 sqq.; Bréquigny, 97 sqq.; Rym. ix. 756 sqq.

² D.K.R. xli. 723; Tit. Liv. 70; St Denys, vi. 310.

³ Plancher, iii. 512; Itin. 447; Gachard, 241; Juv. 549.

⁴ Rym. ix. 756; D.K.R. xli. 775.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 73 sq.; Vita, 217 sq.

⁶ Rym. ix. 756, 758; D.K.R. xli. 783, 787.

⁷ Rym. ix. 759.

⁸ Ibid. 761; Tit. Liv. 74; Vita, 220; Monstr. iii. 319; Juv. 549; Norm. Chron. 194.

⁹ Juv. (549) gives the names of those on the French side, the most notable being the archbishop of Sens, Henri de Savoisy.

till seven o'clock they seem to have consisted mostly of feasting and ceremonial. At the close Henry departed to Mantes and Isabel to Pontoise¹.

Two days later all met again, and this time the princess Catherine was present². She was escorted by the duke of Burgundy's young nephew, the count of St Pol³, and very charming she must have looked, for 3000 florins had been spent upon her dresses and other finery for the day, in spite of the destitution of the country⁴. The English marked the sweetness of her maiden blush as Henry kissed her and took her hand before following her into the tent⁵. Catherine did not appear again at Meulan, but Henry was conquered at first sight, and three months later, when he heard of the murder at Montereau, his first cry was that now he would have the lady Catherine, for whom he had so greatly longed⁶. Other meetings followed on June 5 and 8⁷, and each time there was dinner and great ceremony. At the first meeting it had been decided that the conferences should be continued until some final decision was taken about the conclusion of peace, and that if nevertheless they should fail to attain this end, at least eight days' notice should be given before the resumption of hostilities⁸. In the actual negotiations the English king was to be represented by a committee consisting of Archbishop Chichele, Bishop Beaufort, and the dukes of Clarence, Gloucester, and Exeter, who were fully empowered to treat for a final peace and a marriage between Henry and Catherine⁹. But no sooner were vital questions approached than it appeared that in spite of all preliminary discussion, there was still a great difference of opinion on fundamentals. When Henry claimed that his hold on Normandy and all the territory covered by the treaty of Brétigny must be absolutely independent¹⁰, the French raised objections. When on the other hand they required that he should renounce all claims to Touraine, Anjou, Maine,

¹ Tit. Liv. 74; Vita, 222 sq.; Gesta, 130; Chron. Ric. II-Hen. VI, 49; Monstr. iii. 320; Le Fèvre, i. 361; Waurin, ii. 268; Juv. 550; Delpit, 227.

² Itin. 448.

³ Waurin, ii. 268.

⁴ H. Moranvillé, 436.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 74; Vita, 222; Kingsford, Lit. 333.

⁶ Waurin, ii. 286.

⁷ Itin. 448; Tit. Liv. 74; Vita, 223.

⁸ Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 372.

⁹ Their commissions were dated June 1 (Rym. ix. 791; D.K.R. xli. 783).

¹⁰ Rym. ix. 779, 789; Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 362, 365; St Denys, vi. 326; Juv. 550 sq.; J. Chartier (Vallet de Viriville), iii. 217.

Brittany and Flanders, and that he should give up his claims in Ponthieu and Montreuil in return for an equivalent in Aquitaine, he refused to listen. When they insisted that any final peace should apply to the allies of both parties, Henry would not hear of the inclusion of the Scots. When they argued that from the 800,000 crowns promised as Catherine's dowry there should be deducted 600,000 that should have been returned with Richard II's queen, Isabel of France, on that king's deposition, he said that this matter should be considered in connection with the English claim for the arrears of the ransom of King John; and on their demanding a further rebate of 400,000 crowns on account of Isabel's jewels, he said that they were not worth a quarter of that sum. The French afterwards blamed Henry for making extraordinary demands¹, but from the outset he knew that the duke of Burgundy was inclining towards an alliance with the dauphin, and quite early in the conference it was known that Tanneguy du Chastel and other envoys from the dauphin had arrived at Pontoise bent on wrecking the negotiations². Each night as the principals returned from Meulan to Pontoise, the arguments of the day were minutely scanned and the most was made of difficulties. The duke seemed wavering, and sought the advice of two learned clerks of his own party. One of them, Nicolas Raolin³, urged that they must perforce conciliate the king of England if France was not to change her lord. He was too powerful, and his conquests must be accepted as accomplished facts. Besides, everybody knew that the dauphin had been treating with him, and the best course therefore was to be beforehand. When the bargain was completed, the dauphin would certainly come into line, and Paris and other cities would follow Rouen and recognise the inevitable. The other clerk, Jean Rapiout, took up the opposite attitude. "The king of France," he said, "cannot give away rights inherited from his forbears," and even if he could, why should he give them up to the son of a usurper⁴, whose contracts would all be annulled when the avenger overthrew his dynasty? Besides, how did they know that the vassals affected would be content to change their

¹ Monstr. iii. 321; Waurin, ii. 269.

² Monstr. iii. 321; Juv. 551.

³ Ibid. He was one of the *mâtres des requêtes* of the duke of Burgundy (La Barre, ii. 194; Fauquembergue, i. 280 n.).

⁴ Juv. 551. Rapiout was one of the presidents of the *Parlement* of Paris (Fauquembergue, i. 141 et passim).

allegiance? The treaty of Brétigny had broken down before, and how could they expect to revive it now? This speech made the greater impression on the duke. It is clear that Henry's full terms had not previously been disclosed to the duke's supporters¹, and now that the facts were getting out, he began to see that his attitude towards Henry's claims was viewed with undisguised apprehension by many of his own party; and we have it on the authority of Queen Isabel herself that though Henry's terms were agreeable to her and the duke, they were warned that to accept them publicly would cause all the nobles and towns among their supporters to go over to the dauphin². The duke at once began to withdraw from his difficult position. When the time came to formulate in writing the promises that he had been willing to make by word of mouth³, he raised objections, and wanted Henry to bind himself never to accept the crown of France, whether by purchase, cession, transfer, or in any other way whatsoever. Henry regarded this demand as prejudicial to his rights and derogatory to his honour⁴. At a private interview with the duke at Meulan, he told him hotly⁵ that his actions showed that the conference was only talk. The dauphin's agents, he knew, were busy at Pontoise, and he must have a final answer⁶. For himself, he would gladly go forward with the bargain and the marriage scheme, "but if this is not to be, we will hustle the king out of his kingdom and you with him!" "Sire," retorted the duke, "you will be pretty tired ere you fling us out. Be very sure of that⁷!" The exact date of this meeting is not known⁸; but a note of discord was struck on June 10 when Henry ordered that no food should be sent out of Normandy, as merchants from Paris and elsewhere were coming to buy provisions presumably to victual French towns and strongholds⁹. When the French arrived at the conference ground on June 13, they found the English drawn up with spears and banners at the very edge

¹ Cf. "le traité secretement comenchié par Monseigneur (i.e. Charles VI) et vous (Henry)," *Beaucourt*, i. 186 sqq.

² See her letter to Henry V dated Troyes, Sept. 20, 1419 (*Beaucourt*, i. 299).

³ *Rym.* ix. 789; *Brit. Mus. Add. MS.* 24,062, f. 194 b.

⁴ *Rym.* ix. 790.

⁵ *Monstr.* iii. 321.

⁶ *Juv.* 551.

⁷ *Monstr.* iii. 321 sq.; *Le Fèvre*, i. 362.

⁸ The date has been given as June 5 (*Plancher*, iii. 512), but after such a stormy conversation, serious negotiations would have been impossible for some time. The interview probably took place just before the final breach.

⁹ *Rym.* ix. 765.

of their encampment, rumours having been circulated that they might be attacked. Nevertheless the day passed pleasantly, with the usual dinner, and at the next conference, on June 16, King Henry made amends by feasting not only his own men but the French also, giving them specially good fare¹. Suspicion, however, continued to grow, and the air was full of disturbing rumours. The principals met again on June 22 and June 30²; but this was the end of discussion. For when Henry came on the ground according to arrangement on July 3, neither the queen nor the duke appeared³. On the 5th Archbishop Chichele and the earl of Warwick were deputed to proceed to Pontoise to ascertain on what day it would be convenient to have another personal interview about the marriage⁴. But the duke refused to see them, alleging that the English proposals were vague, unreasonable and obscure⁵. Thus the conference ended, its only result being that Henry's eagerness for the marriage was increased⁶. In England the view was officially promulgated that a treaty of peace had been arranged before the meeting at Meulan—presumably at Mantes and Vernon—that in this Henry had agreed to accept less than his full rights, but that the French would not agree to any reasonable final arrangement⁷.

The explanation of the duke's conduct lies partly in his relations with the dauphin. In the latter part of the winter the Armagnac troops had been very aggressive. On Feb. 25 they captured Beaumont-sur-Oise⁸, on March 8 Soissons⁹. It was doubtless this activity that led the duke of Burgundy to send messengers to the dauphin with proposals for a truce, which was concluded, though in somewhat vague terms, on May 14¹⁰. In consequence, emissaries of the dauphin, as we have seen, were able to make mischief at Pontoise during the conferences at Meulan. Meanwhile, a complete reconciliation was being promoted by Alan

¹ Tit. Liv. 74 sq.; Vita, 224.

² Itin. 448.

³ Kingsford, Lit. 334; Tit. Liv. 75; Vita, 225; Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 24,062, f. 195.

⁴ Rym. ix. 776; D.K.R. xli. 789.

⁵ Rym. ix. 789 sq.; Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 24,062, f. 194 b.

⁶ Immediately after the end of the conference Henry sent Catherine presents of jewellery said to have been worth 100,000 crowns; they were, however, captured by the enemy before they reached her (St Denys, vi. 364; also *Abrégé* in J. Chartier [Vallet de Viriville], iii. 212, 225).

⁷ Rot. Parl. iv. 116.

⁸ Vallet de Viriville, i. 147.

⁹ St Denys, vi. 318.

¹⁰ Juv. 548. Juvénal des Ursins was at this time at Poitiers and had excellent means of getting to know what was proceeding in the inner councils of the dauphin's party.

of Kerabret, bishop of St Pol de Léon, who had lately returned from the Council of Constance commissioned by the pope to compose the feuds of France by any possible means¹. Under his influence the duke on June 28 sent envoys to the dauphin, then at Melun, to arrange a meeting². On July 7 he left Pontoise³; next day he visited the dauphin at the fortress of Pouilly near Melun⁴; and on the 9th they discussed peace in a hut which had been erected for the purpose on a bridge over the Biherel about three miles north-west of Melun⁵. No agreement was reached, and a subsequent meeting was equally abortive. The attempt was on the point of being abandoned, but the principals were persuaded to make one more effort⁶, and this time their conversation led to an understanding⁷, which after further debate ripened into a formal treaty of peace, signed on July 11⁸. The duke agreed that the past should be forgotten, that he would submit himself to the dauphin, behave as his true and loyal kinsman, help him to maintain his estate, and aid him against any who should make war upon him. The dauphin on his side consented to cherish his very dear cousin the duke and defend him against any man living. All past offences were to be blotted out and all heritages restored. The faction names of Burgundian and Armagnac should cease. The two chiefs would henceforth live in harmony, help jointly in all the business of the kingdom, make no treaty or alliance with the enemies of their king on pain of excommunication and would repudiate any such already made.

On July 17 the duke of Burgundy was back at Pontoise⁹. Two days later a royal ordinance was issued confirming all that had been done¹⁰. All offences were to be pardoned, all confisca-

¹ Ordonnances, xii. 268, 274; St Denys, vi. 332, 336.

² Barante, iii. 279.

³ Ibid.; Itin. 448.

⁴ Ibid.; Monstr. iii. 322; Le Fèvre, i. 364; Waurin, ii. 271.

⁵ Rym. ix. 779; St Denys, ix. 328, 342, 344; J. Chartier (Vallet de Virville), iii. 218; Waurin, ii. 271; Félibien, ii. 797; Barante, iii. 279; Plancher, iii. 513, 514.

⁶ This seems to have been accomplished mainly by the mediation of Jeanne, mother of Pierre de Giac, one of the duke's escort. She was one of the queen's ladies of honour, had known the dauphin from his childhood, had great influence with the duke, and was withal a "venerable and prudent lady" (Cordeliers, 280; St Denys, vi. 332; Monstr. iii. 322; Le Fèvre, i. 364; Waurin, ii. 271).

⁷ St Denys, vi. 332; Le Fèvre, i. 364; Ordonnances, xii. 274; Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 356; Rym. ix. 756, 778.

⁸ Ordonnances, xii. 263; Plancher, iii. 515; Beaucourt, Meurtre, 230; Chastellain, i. 32. The text is given in Rym. ix. 776; St Denys, vi. 334 sqq.; Monstr. iii. 324 sqq.

⁹ Itin. 449.

¹⁰ Ordonnances, xii. 263, 275; Tillet, Recueil, 124 b.

tions annulled, all garrisons set free to operate against the English. The *Parlement* at Poitiers was recognised as the supreme court¹, and the queen, the duke and the dauphin were to share alike in advising and deliberating in the royal Council. Meanwhile news of the reconciliation had been trumpeted abroad, and Paris had abandoned itself to demonstrative rejoicing².

¹ Ordonnances, xi. 15.

² J. Chartier (Vallet de Viriville), iii. 221 (Abrégé); Douët d'Arcq, i. 403.

CHAPTER LXI

DIPLOMATIC FAILURE AND MILITARY SUCCESS

IT must not be supposed that Henry's diplomatic activity was concerned solely with the French. It was a time when the relations between England and the papacy were somewhat critical. Martin V owed his election largely to the influence of Bishop Beaufort, and he seems to have thought that in Henry he had a willing tool. The king had been in communication with him in the early days of the siege of Rouen¹, and early in 1419 Bishop Caterick had a private interview with him at Mantua². At this the pope was much moved; he declared himself convinced that Henry really did love him, and said that all the theologians in the world could not have touched him so much as the king's divine eloquence. The purport of this eloquence can only be conjectured; but there is little doubt that Henry was seeking help of some kind against the French, for Martin promised that he would be Henry's "secretarius," and that his recent letter should not fall into French hands. On his side he had sent two letters to the king, enclosed in one to Chichele, with injunctions that the contents should be kept strictly secret and that the letters should be burnt as soon as they had been read. What the pope offered is not known, but it is probable that part of the price at least was to be the repeal of the Statute of Provisors. It is likely that Henry had raised hopes that the statute might be annulled, but when in the summer of this year the pope formally pressed for this³, the king pointed out that neither he nor his father had been in any way concerned in the passing of the statute and that it could not be repealed without the consent of the "Three Estates⁴."

The same months saw the promotion to the episcopate of two of the most faithful agents of Henry's diplomacy. On March 2, 1419, Thomas Peverell, bishop of Worcester, died⁵.

¹ Rym. ix. 680.

³ Ibid. 806.

⁵ Bund, 405, 407.

² Ibid.

⁴ Ibid. 808.

The king having granted the *congé d'élire*¹, the monks of Worcester, on April 24², elected Philip Morgan, archdeacon of Norfolk, and chancellor of the duchy of Normandy. Meanwhile, the see of Rochester having fallen vacant by the death, on Oct. 28, 1418, of Richard Yonge³, the chapter had chosen John Kemp⁴, archdeacon of Durham and keeper of the privy seal. Martin V, requested to confirm both elections, followed the usual practice of the papacy at this time, and provided Morgan and Kemp to the sees in question⁵. On Dec. 3, 1419, both were consecrated in Rouen cathedral by the bishops of Arras and Hebron⁶.

Negotiations for papal support were of course in the usual order of things in the Middle Ages. Less conventional were some of Henry's other dealings, notably those with Naples, which have been strangely neglected by modern historians, perhaps because they led to nothing, though they afford evidence of the extraordinary boldness and range of the king's ambition. Naples was ruled by Queen Joan II, who had succeeded her brother Ladislas in 1414. She was then forty-four years old, a widow, and notorious for her licentious life. She was childless, and it seemed as though with her the Durazzo line of the house of Anjou would come to an end. It was for a time doubtful whether she would choose an Englishman or a Frenchman as her second husband⁷; but in 1415 her choice fell on Jacques, count of La Marche. In 1418, however, after violent quarrels, he escaped from the imprisonment to which Joan had consigned him, and after many vicissitudes returned to France. Joan had already begun to consider the adoption of some powerful personage as her heir, and had had some dealings with Henry's representatives at Constance. Eventually she offered to adopt John duke of Bedford. On Feb. 28, 1419, Henry signified his assent⁸, and on March 12 Thomas Polton and Agostino de Lante of Pisa were formally appointed to con-

¹ At Évreux, on March 25 (Rym. ix. 714; Bund, 406).

² Bund, 405.

³ Le Neve, ii. 565; Gams, 196; Eubel, i. 444.

⁴ Le Neve, ii. 566; Eubel, i. 444.

⁵ Cal. Pap. Lett. vii. 133.

⁶ Bund, 390; Stubbs, Reg. 86.

⁷ Albizzi, i. 267. It is, however, probably a mistake to suppose that the "orator principis Galilee" who was at Florence in Oct., 1414, in order to get the support of the Signory for his master's suit for Joan's hand, had anything to do with the prince of Wales, as Faraglia (45) assumes. The suitor was probably Henri de Lusignan, prince of Galilee, son of James I, king of Cyprus.

⁸ Rym. ix. 701.

duct the consequent negotiations¹. Polton does not appear to have gone to Naples in person, but he drew up a schedule of instructions for his two colleagues, Agostino de Lante and John Fitton, who were to conduct the discussions with the queen. They were to ascertain the exact strength of the parties that respectively favoured her and her husband and the conditions under which Bedford might hope to succeed to the throne. They were to press for an allowance to him of not less than 60,000 ducats a year, while certain harbours were to be reserved to him.

After conversations between the English agents and those of the queen, it was agreed that nothing should be finally settled until the consent of the pope had been obtained. Subject to this, however, and in consideration of the likelihood that the French would resist the treaty by force, the English would pay the queen 50,000 ducats, which would be deposited at Gaeta and must not be touched until Reggio and Brindisi had actually been handed over to Bedford's representatives. Within eight months after that the duke would come to Naples, bringing 1000 men-at-arms and 2000 archers, whose wages he would himself pay for six months. The queen would make him duke of Calabria (a title bestowed only on the heir to the throne), with full power over that province, and place in his hands all the strongholds in her possession. Bedford, furthermore, should have as his own all that he could conquer from the queen's enemies, and should be declared her successor, not only in the kingdom of Naples but also in the county of Provence², which was actually held by the duchess of Anjou, who belonged to the rival line.

Nothing seems to have come of this agreement. The queen had papal support and in Oct. 1419 was crowned at Naples³. Perhaps she no longer felt the need of English aid. In 1420, indeed, she seems to have been inclined to reopen negotiations with Bedford⁴; but the result cannot have been encouraging, for in 1421 she adopted as her heir the young king of Aragon, Alfonso V.

Meanwhile Henry was trying to find the duke of Bedford a

¹ Rym. ix. 705; D.K.R. xli. 742; Iss. Roll 7 Hen. V, Pasch., April 20, 1419. Polton was at the court of Rome (Lenz, 186).

² Rym. ix. 706 sq.

³ Ametller y Vinyas, i. 39, 41; Giannone, ii. 304.

⁴ Rym. ix. 865, where she commissions Agostino de Lante to carry a message from her to the duke.

wife as well as a mother. He was now thirty, and after Henry's successes might look as high as he pleased. Four years before, indeed, a marriage with a princess of Aragon had been proposed¹, and when in 1417 the young widow, Jacqueline of Hainault, was in difficulties with her uncle the bishop of Liége, his name was put forward as that of a possible sharer of her country and fortunes. But when Jacqueline married the duke of Brabant, Bedford had to look elsewhere. On March 18, 1419, Henry despatched John Colville and Richard Leyot, dean of St Asaph, to make a round of the suitable courts of Germany and see what could be done². They were to visit the duke of Lorraine, who had two little daughters, Isabel and Catherine, though the envoys seem to have been so ill-informed that they fancied there was only one³. They were to ask for the hand of Isabel, the elder, who was only eight years of age. They found, however, that the duke, though a strong Burgundian, had just arranged a marriage between her and René the third son of the duchess of Anjou⁴. Accordingly they went on to see what could be done with the margrave of Brandenburg, Frederick of Hohenzollern. As Vicar of the Empire in Sigismund's absence he had held a Diet at Nördlingen in Franconia in April⁵. The envoys were to approach him as one of those included with Sigismund in the Canterbury treaty, and to ask for the hand of his only daughter; but nothing came of the suggestion, and it is not even known whether they had an interview with him. According to their commission they were next to approach Sigismund himself to see if he had any kinswoman available. But Sigismund was by this time back in Hungary⁶, and no one knows if he so much as received a message from the envoys. After all the duke of Bedford remained a bachelor four years longer, in the end marrying Anne daughter of John duke of Burgundy.

In all these transactions there seems to be strong evidence of Henry's ambition to ring France round with enemies by means of marriage alliances and other Napoleonic methods. He was allied with Sigismund. He had in his pay the three

¹ Cf. vol. i. 97.

² Rym. ix. 710 sq.; Calmet, iii. 533.

³ Rym. ix. 710.

⁴ It was formally announced on May 20, 1419 (Calmet, iii. 533; Vallet de Virville, i. 151; Lecoy de la Marche, i. 55).

⁵ Brandenburg, 80; Reichstagsakten, vii. 383.

⁶ Altmann, i. 268-272; Aschbach, ii. 482; Lenz, 202.

great elector archbishops of Cologne¹, Mainz, and Trier². Negotiations were pending to win over the Genoese. Their representatives had been approached at Constance as to a renewal of friendly relations³, and on Feb. 26, 1419, William Bardolph and other commissioners were appointed to treat with them at Calais⁴, but, notwithstanding prolonged negotiations, no agreement was reached⁵. At the same time, too, Henry was trying to secure for Humphrey of Gloucester the hand of Blanche, daughter of Charles III of Navarre and widow of Martin of Aragon, king of Sicily, which was governed in her name. The matter had long ago been broached, and in Navarre had received favourable consideration; but Henry had not been able to make up his mind. The king of Navarre demanded, as the price of his consent, some rectification of the boundary between his kingdom and Guienne, and Henry could not bring himself to part with any of his land. His interests were represented at Olite by Charles Beaumont⁶, standard bearer of Navarre, a Frenchman by birth but devoted to the English cause. On April 28, 1419, he sent Henry a message expressing the hope that English envoys would soon arrive, as representatives of both Aragon and Castile were coming to ask the hand of Blanche, the estates of Navarre were pressing the king to come to a settlement, and it was all he could do to secure further delay⁷. Henry had on April 3 approved of Gloucester's appointment of William Beauchamp and John Stokes to negotiate the match⁸. It is doubtful, however, whether they even set out, and in any case the project was fruitless, for on Nov. 5 Blanche was married to John, second son of Ferdinand king of Aragon.

Notwithstanding the negotiations in which he was engaged, Henry's first care after the fall of Rouen was to complete the conquest of Normandy. The dukes of Clarence and Exeter, the earl of Salisbury, and others⁹, were authorised to arrange for the capitulation of walled towns and castles, and fully occupied they were with the task. Caudebec, as we have seen, had undertaken to share the fate of Rouen, and on Jan. 23

¹ Cf. ante, p. 32.

³ Rym. ix. 414 sqq.

⁵ Ibid. 758; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 245 sq., 255 sqq., 266 sq.

⁶ Cf. Wylie, iii. 72.

⁸ Ibid. 716.

⁹ D.K.R. xli. 723, 724, 728; Tit. Liv. 70.

² Rym. ix. 715; D.K.R. xli. 763.

⁴ Ibid. 700.

⁷ Rym. ix. 741.

Lewis Robsart and Roger Fiennes were commissioned to receive its submission, the former being appointed captain of the place¹. With it fell fourteen other places in the vicinity that were bound by a similar contract², and then "all the residue of Normandy yielded³." A French account says that thirty-five towns and castles surrendered shortly after the fall of Rouen, and the number is probably not exaggerated⁴. The town of Montivilliers, which for more than two years had held out as a standing menace to the English at Harfleur, yielded to Hugh Lutterell on Jan. 23⁵. On Jan. 31 Lillebonne⁶, on the next day Fécamp⁷ and Étrepagny surrendered⁸. Tancarville yielded about the same time⁹, Vernon on Feb. 3¹⁰, Mantes, forestalling attack, on Feb. 5¹¹. Dieppe submitted on Feb. 8¹²; Arques had already done so¹³. Gournay and Neufchâtel-en-Bray gave in on the 9th¹⁴. On Feb. 15 Eu with several adjacent castles, surrendered to the duke of Exeter¹⁵, the whole county being granted to William Bouchier, in whose family the title "count of Eu" remained for at least 250 years¹⁶. Honfleur had baffled the English attack in 1417, but it capitulated on Feb. 25 after a short siege by the earl of Salisbury¹⁷. These and other surrenders of less note placed all Normandy in English hands¹⁸, with the exception of the frontier fortresses of Mont-St-Michel, Château Gaillard, Gisors, La Roche Guyon, and Ivry. Of these La Roche Guyon, though regarded as impregnable, was the first to fall. It was defended against the earl of Warwick for two

¹ D.K.R. xli. 708; Bréquigny, 44.

² Stow, Chron. 357; Puiseux, 106.

³ Peter. Chron. 489. Cf. Gesta, 129; Norm. Chron. 191; Waurin, ii. 265; Monstr. iii. 309; St Denys, vi. 320; Fenin, 106.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 309.

⁵ Rym. ix. 674; Tit. Liv. 70; Vita, 205.

⁶ Rym. ix. 677.

⁷ Ibid.; Bréquigny, 47, 214; Vita, 205.

⁸ Rym. ix. 678; Bréquigny, 47.

⁹ D.K.R. xli. 751. On the same day it was granted to John Grey of Heton (Bréquigny, 47; D.K.R. xli. 723).

¹⁰ Rym. ix. 679; Bréquigny, 47. At Vernon a temporary truce had been arranged in the previous autumn in order that the vintage might be gathered (Bréquigny, 209; D.K.R. xli. 697; Gachard, 663 a). William Porter was made captain (Rym. ix. 693; D.K.R. xli. 731).

¹¹ [Durand and Grave, 270; Newhall, 127 sq.]; Bourgeois, 121; Norm. Chron. 192.

¹² Rym. ix. 682; Bréquigny, 58; D.K.R. xli. 742, 746; Vita, 205. Dieppe was placed in the keeping of William Bouchier (D.K.R. xli. 727, 730; Bréquigny, 52).

¹³ D.K.R. xli. 727.

¹⁴ Rym. ix. 683; Bréquigny, 53.

¹⁵ Rym. ix. 695; Bréquigny, 55, 78, 104; D.K.R. xli. 728, 746, 765.

¹⁶ Bréquigny, 99; Yorks. Arch. and Topog. Journ. ix. 401 sqq.

¹⁷ Rym. ix. 698; Bréquigny, 57; D.K.R. xli. 746; Blondel, Reductio, 154.

¹⁸ Orig. Lett., Ser. II, i. 76.

months by the lady of the place, Perette de la Rivière, who beat off many assaults. But, on the advice of Guy le Bouteiller, the former captain of Rouen, Warwick enlarged the caves in the cliff on which the castle stood, and with its foundations thus undermined, it surrendered by May 1, the lady being allowed to leave with her sons after refusing an offer of marriage with le Bouteiller, to whom the place was subsequently granted¹. Ivry was besieged by the duke of Gloucester towards the end of March². After much fighting the town was stormed, but the castle, which was very strong, held out for some time longer³. On May 10, however, the worn-out garrison capitulated, and four days later the fortress passed into the hands of the English⁴, who were now able to raid far and wide in the Chartrain⁵. As for Château Gaillard, though the duke of Exeter was ordered to attack it in April⁶, it was not reduced till the following autumn, while for the present Gisors was left alone.

The resistance of these places did not deter Henry from pressing his invasion far beyond the limits of Normandy. Though the negotiations at Meulan had done little to promote the cause of peace, they had given him and the duke of Burgundy an opportunity of arranging a truce which should last till July 29⁷. The interval was used by Henry to attempt the renewal of the discussions. Though the English at Mantes knew all about the meeting of the duke and the dauphin⁸, Henry on July 19 sent representatives to the duke, who was again at Pontoise, to ask that negotiations might proceed⁹, and on the 22nd safe-conducts were issued for four envoys to come to Mantes¹⁰, two of them being Armagnacs who had been with the dauphin at Pouilly. The French seem to have met English commissioners, and to have advised delay until the duke and

¹ Bréquigny, 93, 131; D.K.R. xli. 800; Tit. Liv. 72; Vita, 212; Champollion-Figeac, Lettres, ii. 341; Monstr. iii. 337; Fenin, 569; St Denys, vi. 312; Juv. 545. The lady has been much praised for refusing to keep her possessions at the price of her patriotism, but it is worthy of remark that within three months she received, at her own request, a safe-conduct for an interview with Henry (Rym. ix. 773).

² Norm. Chron. 193.

³ Ibid.; Tit. Liv. 72; D.K.R. xlii. 314.

⁴ Bréquigny, 20 sq.; Tit. Liv. 72; St Denys, vi. 326. The terms of the capitulation were incorrectly entered in the Norman roll of 6 Hen. V.

⁵ Norm. Chron. 193. [They got as far south as Janville, Newhall, 132, citing Brit. Mus. Add. Ch. 76.]

⁶ Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 12.

⁷ Rym. ix. 782.

⁸ This appears from a letter written at Mantes on July 14 by a certain R. Prior, of whose position we know nothing (Rym. ix. 779).

⁹ Ibid. 782.

¹⁰ Ibid. 783; Beaucourt, Meurtre, 221, 226.

the dauphin had met again; they explained that though Henry's proposals were very welcome, it would be difficult to get the nobles and the towns to accept them unless the dauphin had done so¹. But it at once became apparent that the duke had no serious intention in resuming relations with Henry, for on July 23 he and the royal party left Pontoise for St Denis².

If the duke thought that he was making Henry his dupe, he was grievously mistaken. The truce expired on July 29³. Next day⁴ the king ordered the gates of Mantes to be kept shut, and suffered no civilians to pass out. At mid-day a strong body of his personal guard left the town, none knew whither. Another force, provided with scaling ladders, left at nightfall, and it now became clear that a dash was to be made for Pontoise. The attackers, numbering in all 3000 men⁵, were divided into two sections, one under Gaston de Foix, who had just been made count of Longueville⁶, the other under the earl of Huntingdon. The suburbs of Pontoise had all been burnt in anticipation of an attack by the Armagnacs, and the lie of the ground was known to many Englishmen who had visited the place during the recent negotiations⁷. It was garrisoned by a force of 1000 men-at-arms and 2000 crossbowmen⁸ under the lord of L'Isle Adam, and owing to the presence of the court had recently been provisioned for about two years. All went well with the force under Gaston de Foix, who left their horses at a little distance from the town, crept up under cover of darkness, and lay concealed in the trenches of some vineyards near the western wall. Here they waited for a signal from the earl of Huntingdon, whose force had made a wide detour to the east to bar the road to Paris. But the earl had lost his way and got entangled in a marsh, so as sunrise approached the count's

¹ Beaucourt, i. 186, where is quoted in full a letter of Queen Isabel to Henry written at Troyes on Sept. 20, 1419.

² Barante, iii. 286.

³ A proclamation was issued on the 30th stating that it had ended (Tit. Liv. 75; Vita, 227; Gesta, 130).

⁴ Kingsford, Lit. 334; Sharpe, London, iii. 364; Delpit, 227; Monstr. iii. 332; Waurin, ii. 273; Le Fèvre, i. 366.

⁵ Monstr. iii. 332; St Denys, vi. 312.

⁶ On June 11 (Rym. ix. 766, 772; D.K.R. xli. 789). He was the second son of Archambaud de Grailly, count of Foix, who had abandoned the English connection (Wylie, ii. 316), and brother of Jean, count of Foix at this time. He held the family lands in Gascony and the title of Captal de Buch (*ibid.* 315; Anselme, iii. 371, 381; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 266, 268).

⁷ Le Fèvre, i. 366.

⁸ St Denys, vi. 312; Monstr. iii. 330, 333.

party determined to run the risk alone. About four in the morning¹ some of them sprang from their hiding and planted their ladders² against the wall, which they found almost unguarded, the watch having come down to attend their early Mass and take their morning drink³. The storming party flung open one of the gates, through which the rest streamed rapidly, shouting "St George! Ville gagnée⁴!" The garrison, recovering from their surprise, made a dangerous rally, but the gate was so smashed that it could not be closed. For a short time both sides fought savagely in the streets; but the attackers gained in numbers, the sound of Huntingdon's trumpets was heard approaching, the townsfolk busied themselves with hiding their effects, and when the captain shouted "Sauve qui peut!" from the wall, the garrison, already much demoralised, flung away their crossbows, opened all the gates, and beat a hasty retreat, those who fled across the bridge falling into the hands of the earl's party, while those who took the Beauvais road were robbed by Burgundian plunderers⁵. All looting was forbidden at the great abbeys of St Martin and Maubuisson in the suburbs⁶, but the town itself was given up to pillage, the inhabitants lost almost all that they possessed⁷, and vast stores were captured, valued according to one account at 2,000,000 crowns⁸. Henry was delighted at the success of this *coup de main*; he had a *Te Deum* sung and on Aug. 5 wrote to the mayor of London saying that for charm and wealth and commanding position he had as yet made no conquest that could equal Pontoise⁹. It was the most notable capture which he had made in "France" as distinguished from Normandy, and in subsequent negotiations he absolutely refused to consider its surrender.

¹ Douët d'Arcq, i. 404; Worcester, Itin. 351; Martial de Paris, i. 33.

² Largely made of rope (St Denys, vi. 346).

³ Le Fèvre, i. 366; cf. Monstr. iii. 333; Douët d'Arcq, i. 404.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 333.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 75 sqq.; Vita, 226 sqq.; St Denys, vi. 350 sq.; Monstr. iii. 333; Trou,

119.

⁶ St Denys, vi. 352.

⁷ Rym. x. 55.

⁸ Juv. 552; cf. Le Fèvre, i. 367; Waurin, ii. 274; Monstr. iii. 333; Worcester, Itin. 351, where it is said that thirty-two knights were captured.

⁹ Delpit, 227; cf. Wals. ii. 330. For a similar letter to the mayor from the duke of Clarence, see Sharpe, iii. 364. L'Isle Adam was very naturally accused of treachery, it being said that he gave up the fight as soon as his money and valuables had been safely removed (St Denys, vi. 352). On the other hand, Jean Juvéal (552) praises the valour he showed in the defence of the town.

On Aug. 6 Henry moved from Mantes and transferred his headquarters to his new possession, where he stayed in the castle for a week or two¹. Strategically, indeed, he had scored a signal success. He had the whole of the Vexin in his hands; he had vastly replenished his stores; and by seizing the bridge of Pontoise he had removed the last obstacle that barred his way to Paris². Nevertheless, his position was beset with dangers. Peace, which but a few weeks ago seemed to be standing at the door³, had now vanished into the remote distance, and with it the hopes of a marriage with the princess Catherine. There was no choice but to go further and further with the war, which was every day growing more irksome and distasteful to Henry's people. What was worse, alarming reports kept pouring in showing that the more he advanced towards the east, the weaker became his hold on his earlier conquests. In June there was a formidable invasion of the Cotentin⁴, Avranches and Pontorson being captured by the French⁵. Salisbury, who was lieutenant of Normandy south of the Seine⁶, came to repel the raiders; the feudal levy of the Cotentin was called out⁷; and on July 14 Avranches was recovered⁸, though Pontorson probably remained in French hands for some months⁹. There were, too, disquieting signs of disaffection nearer Henry's headquarters. At Beaumont-le-Roger the *bailli* was unable to exercise his jurisdiction owing to the prevalence of brigandage, and arrangements had to be made for him to hold his court in the castle of La Rivière de Thibouville¹⁰. Formidable conspiracies were being hatched at Rouen¹¹ and Dieppe¹². On Aug. 18 the king issued orders to captains of fortified towns to see that all the soldiers of their garrisons lived and slept within the walls¹³. The eastern frontier of the duchy was the scene of much fighting. In August St Martin-le-Gaillard was recovered by

¹ Bréquigny, 104; D.K.R. xli. 792.

³ *Ibid.* 789.

⁵ Mont-St-Michel, i. 22; Juv. 552.

⁷ Bréquigny, 100.

⁹ The earl of Suffolk, appointed captain of Pontorson on June 12 (Bréquigny, 99), did not draw any money in that capacity up to the following May 1 (Exch. Accts. 187/14).

¹¹ Tit. Liv. 75; Vita, 226. On Sept. 6 orders were issued defining more clearly the duties of the captain in supporting the civil officers in maintaining order (Bréquigny, 106).

¹² *Ibid.*, where directions, dated Sept. 8, are given for crushing a conspiracy at Dieppe.

¹³ *Ibid.* 104.

² Delpit, 227; Rym. ix. 790.

⁴ Bréquigny, 100.

⁶ Rym. ix. 739.

⁸ *Ibid.* 33.

¹⁰ Bréquigny, 105.

the French and relieved by the lord of Gamaches from Compiègne when the English tried to recapture it. The approach of superior forces, however, compelled the French to withdraw, and immediately afterwards the earl of Huntingdon led a raid far into enemy country and burned Breteuil¹. On the Maine frontier fortune was still more capricious. Ambroise de Loré, who was making a name for himself among patriotic Frenchmen, inflicted a sharp reverse on a force commanded by the earl of March, and even took Sées, though he did not try to hold it. Not long afterwards, however, he was defeated and captured by Gilbert Halsall, *bailli* of Évreux, who was raiding in Maine². To counterbalance this, the English were in August worsted in a fight near Mortain, many prisoners and banners being sent to Paris in consequence³.

Much more serious than the vicissitudes of frontier warfare were the diplomatic successes of the dauphin's party. Towards the end of 1418 both he and the duke of Burgundy had been in negotiation with the Scots⁴; there were already a few Scottish troops serving under the dauphin⁵ and possibly some in the army of the duke⁶. Before the end of March, 1419, further help had been promised to the dauphin by a Scottish embassy, more Scots had arrived, and a French mission had gone to Castile to try to secure transport for a big force⁷. In May Sir William Douglas was retained by the dauphin with 150 men-at-arms and 300 archers⁸, and there were more than 300 other Scots in his service⁹. The Scottish envoys had gone to Spain, and, adding their arguments to those of the French, they prevailed on the king of Castile to sign a convention, dated at Segovia on June 28, whereby he undertook to provide for the transport of troops from Scotland 40 armed ships and 20 galleys, with 200 men-at-arms and 4000 mariners and crossbowmen. They were to go at once to Belle Isle, whence, under Admiral Braquemont, they should proceed to Scotland¹⁰. A fresh embassy from the dauphin was sent thither to make the most of the Scottish

¹ Norm. Chron. 194 sq.; Monstr. iii. 335 sq.; Juv. 546.

² Juv. 546. [The chronology of these events is quite obscure, though Professor Newhall gives reason for believing that Loré was captured in May, 1419 (p. 137).]

³ St Denys, vi. 362; Juv. 552.

⁴ Beaucourt, i. 306 sqq.

⁵ Forbes-Leith, i. 153; Beaucourt, i. 429.

⁶ Ibid. i. 306 sq.

⁷ Ibid. 308; Daumet, Alliance, 73 sq.; [Newhall, 136].

⁸ Forbes-Leith, i. 153.

⁹ Ibid.; Beaucourt, i. 429.

¹⁰ Ibid. 311; Daumet, Alliance, 74; Circourt, 356, 361, 368 sqq.; Rym. ix. 783 sq.

offer¹, and by the beginning of September the number of Scots in the dauphin's army had considerably increased², though the main expedition had not yet sailed. Meanwhile, a Castilian force had crossed the Pyrenees, overrun the county of Labourd, and plundered to the walls of Bayonne³.

There can be little doubt that these proceedings were all carried out with the connivance of the duke of Burgundy. In March he had sent three esquires to Scotland⁴, and in April the bishop of Orkney and two Scottish lords visited him at Provins, where they stayed several weeks and were treated with special honour⁵. Nor can the duke have made any effort to conceal his relations with them, for English envoys were in the town at the same time⁶. Henry, indeed, seems to have been fully alive to the danger that threatened him. A large fleet was assembled at Southampton under Hugh Courtenay, son of the earl of Devon, who had collected a force of 380 men-at-arms and 760 archers. He had under him two knights, Thomas Carew and John Arundel, together with John Hawley of Dartmouth and Henry Fortescue, all experienced and dashing sailors. He received £1760 to pay the wages of his men for three months from May 1⁷, during which he was to bear the title of "Captain of our Navy" and to exercise large powers "according to maritime law⁸," provided that he did not encroach on the jurisdiction of the admiral, the duke of Exeter. The fleet included four carracks, five *naves*, and eight balingers (all king's ships), manned altogether by 1103 seamen and 50 pagets, with four constables and four carpenters, their wages amounting altogether to more than £797 for the three months. About the end of July, however, Henry got to know of the plans of the Castilian fleet from documents captured by a balinger of Bayonne, observing no doubt with interest that it was instructed to do no injury to the duke of Burgundy⁹; and on Aug. 12 and 24¹⁰ Bedford issued orders to collect more ships to intercept the enemy fleet on its way to Scotland. At the

¹ Beaucourt, i. 320.

² Forbes-Leith, i. 153 sq.

³ Rym. ix. 794 sq. The letter in which the inhabitants announce this news and beg Henry for help is dated Sept. 5.

⁴ Beaucourt, i. 309 sq.

⁵ They dined with the duke on April 11 (Gachard, 240; Itin. 447), and did not leave Provins till May 8 (*ibid.* 446). Cf. Beaucourt, i. 310.

⁶ Cf. ante, p. 162.

⁷ Iss. Roll 7 Hen. V, Pasch., May 20, 1419.

⁸ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 181 sq.

⁹ Rym. ix. 783 sq.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 791, 792.

same time the forces of the northern counties were called out to guard against a possible landing by the foreigners¹. Despite these precautions, however, the Castilian fleet, reinforced by ships of La Rochelle, reached Scotland in September, embarked 6000 men under the earls of Buchan and Wigtown, and landed them safely². On Oct. 29 the two commanders were at the dauphin's court at Bourges³. Their troops were stationed in Touraine⁴. Reinforcements under the earl of Mar were expected, and a fleet was already being prepared to bring them⁵.

¹ Rym. ix. 793. [It may have been the concern caused by the projected expedition from Scotland that led Henry, in August, 1419, to write twice to Lewis, Count Palatine of the Rhine, urging him to supply military aid to the English in the spring of 1420. Henry had evidently given up all hope of an early peace, and was at pains to convince Lewis that he was not to blame for the rupture of the recent negotiations (Finke, *Acta*, iv. 489 sqq.).]

² Forbes-Leith, ii. 198; Beaucourt, i. 320 sq.; Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1210; Pluscard. 353 sq.; Monstr. iii. 357. John Stewart, second son of the duke of Albany, was created earl of Buchan in 1406 (*Exch. Rolls of Scotland*, iv. p. clxxxii). Archibald Douglas, eldest son of the fourth earl of Douglas, was Buchan's brother-in-law; his title of earl of Wigtown seems to have been held by courtesy and not to have been used until he was on the point of leaving for France (*Fraser, Douglas Book*, i. 399, 401, 404; ii. 407 sq., 413).

³ Forbes-Leith, ii. 198.

⁴ Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1210; Pluscard. 354.

⁵ Forbes-Leith, ii. 199; Beaucourt, i. 331.

CHAPTER LXII

THE DUKE OF BURGUNDY'S SKULL

THE duke of Burgundy, with the king and queen of France, arrived at St Denis on July 23, 1419¹. On the morning of the 31st a crowd of fugitives brought the news that Pontoise had fallen², and the duke at once rushed the king and queen away³, arriving that same night at Lagny, where he remained for a week⁴. Here he must have received Henry's reply to a message, sent off as soon as the capture of Pontoise was known, asking him once more to consider an offer of peace. Henry's answer took the form of a long despatch⁵, in which he summarised the previous course of the negotiations, and expressed his willingness to proceed, provided that his first conditions were accepted, with the addition that Pontoise, and consequently the whole Vexin, should remain in his hands. Apparently such a demand was too much for the duke, who left Lagny on Aug. 7, and hastening eastward reached Troyes on the 11th⁶, so that no use seems to have been made of safe-conducts issued on the 6th⁷ for two envoys from the duke to approach Henry. The duke's flight from St Denis was well-advised, for on Aug. 2 the duke of Clarence presented himself with a large English force before the gates of Paris⁸, where the citizens were in the wildest alarm. It was of course only a demonstration, and after two or three days he returned to Pontoise⁹. Paris, however, remained in evil plight, for the loss of Pontoise meant the stoppage of the daily supply of many necessaries¹⁰, prices went up to five times the normal, and the writer of the chronicle of St Denis declared that he had never known such frightful dearth in all the seventy years of his life¹¹.

¹ Itin. 449; Monstr. iii. 330; Gachard, 241.

² St Denys, vi. 352; Le Fèvre, i. 367.

⁴ Plancher, iii. 517.

⁶ Plancher, iii. 517; Boutiot, ii. 394.

⁸ Longnon, 212.

⁹ Tit. Liv. 77; Vita, 231; Gesta, 130. It is said that the duke asked to be allowed to pay a visit of devotion to the shrine of St Denis, and when after being refused he went away, he exclaimed, "What you refuse to-day I shall get some other day whether you will or no!" (Juv. 552).

¹⁰ St Denys, vi. 350.

³ St Denys, vi. 354; Monstr. iii. 334.

⁵ Rym. ix. 787 sqq.

⁷ Rym. ix. 785; D.K.R. xli. 792.

¹¹ Ibid. 366.

The chief hope of Paris and the French lay in the execution of the treaty between the dauphin and the duke, according to which they were to meet again within a month to agree upon a plan for pacifying local feuds and driving back the English¹. Hitherto neither side had displayed much interest in this arrangement or much zeal for disbanding its garrisons. On reaching Troyes, however, the duke of Burgundy wrote to the dauphin urging that the meeting should be held as soon as possible. Meanwhile the citizens of Paris, angry at being deserted by the duke, had sent a deputation to the dauphin at Tours, offering to welcome him as their lord². Recognising what might be gained by a conciliatory attitude to popular desires, the dauphin issued a manifesto in which he declared himself ready to fulfil all the terms of the recent reconciliation, and wrote to the duke of Burgundy suggesting that the meeting should take place on Aug. 26 at Montereau³, at the junction of the Seine and the Yonne. The dauphin was there on the day named⁴; but the duke of Burgundy had objected to the place of meeting⁵, and it was only three days later that he arrived at Bray on the Seine, which he made his headquarters during the negotiations that ensued⁶. After several days' discussion it was arranged that the interview should take place on the bridge at Montereau on Sept. 10⁷. Both sides, however, still had misgivings⁸; and it was only the urgent need for peace⁹, the pressure of some of his leading supporters¹⁰, and the offer of the dauphin to hand over the castle of Montereau¹¹, that led the duke to carry out his part of the undertaking.

On the day fixed, the duke, with a number of his principal followers and 700 fighting men, arrived at Montereau and was admitted to the castle¹². Then, with the ten attendants allowed by the agreement, he passed through the elaborate barrier erected at the end of the bridge and entered the fenced enclosure where the interview was to be held. Precisely what

¹ Monstr. iii. 352; Juv. 552; Beaucourt, i. 186, Meurtre, 226.

² The dauphin received them on Aug. 8 (St Denys, vi. 370).

³ Juv. 553; Beaucourt, i. 150, 159.

⁴ Juv. 553.

⁵ Beaucourt, Meurtre, 227.

⁶ Plancher, iii. 522.

⁷ Juv. 533.

⁸ Beaucourt, Meurtre, 227, 233; Douët d'Arcq, i. 405; Chastellain, i. 31.

⁹ Douët d'Arcq, i. 405; La Marche, i. 87, 201.

¹⁰ Monstr. iii. 340 sq.

¹¹ Juv. 552 sq.; Barante, iii. 291; Beaucourt, Meurtre, 226.

¹² Monstr. iii. 341; Trahisons, 144.

followed will never be known. Many stories are extant, ranging from the Armagnac version which states that the duke was only attacked after offering violence to the dauphin¹, to the official Burgundian account, according to which the duke was cut down from behind as he knelt before the dauphin on entering his presence². But, however the deed was done, it is certain that the duke's head was cleft with an axe, that Armagnac troops which had been ready for emergencies in houses near at hand rushed on to the bridge³, captured the duke's attendants, save one⁴, and attacked the Burgundians drawn up before the castle⁵. Most of these fled in panic⁶, and a few who took refuge in the castle found it devoid of artillery or provisions and saved their lives by surrendering at the first threat of bombardment⁷. The duke's body was rescued from insult by the priest of Montereau, who next day had it buried in the parish church⁸.

There has been endless debate about the murder. Most modern French writers, jealous of the good name of the prince who delivered his country from the English, have tried to exculpate him or at least to palliate the crime. Some credence⁹, indeed, has been attached to the contention of the dauphin's council that if there was any premeditated plot, it was formed by the duke, who meant to kidnap the dauphin and owed his death to his own folly¹⁰. But this view never obtained general credit with contemporaries, who called what was done a vile and treacherous murder¹¹. Six years had not passed when Tanneguy du Chastel, who probably struck the first blow¹², showed himself ashamed of his connection with the deed¹³, and in after years the dauphin himself, while always protesting his personal innocence, did not

¹ Beaucourt, i. 181 sqq., Meurtre, 223, 227.

² Chastellain, i. 32; La Marche, i. 198; Beaucourt, i. 188, Meurtre, 231. [One of the most vivid accounts is that of the *Relation inédite de la mort de Jean sans Peur*, printed from a Leyden MS. by Kervyn de Lettenhove (*Compte rendu de la commission royale d'histoire de Belgique, Sér. III, tom. viii, 1866, pp. 92-96*). It is violently Burgundian in tone.]

³ Rel. inéd. 95; La Barre, i. 280, 284, 287, 288, 291; St Foix, iii. 232.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 344; La Barre, i. 287.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid. 291; Itin. 251; Gachard, 242.

⁷ Monstr. iii. 345 sq., 348 sqq.

⁸ La Barre, i. 224.

⁹ See e.g. Beaucourt, i. 172.

¹⁰ La Barre, i. 298.

¹¹ Ibid. 281, 283, 287; Waurin, ii. 287; Chastellain, i. 22; Trahisons, 144; Denifle, Chart. iv. 371 sqq.; Bourgeois, 129; Wals. ii. 330; Vita, 225; Kingsford, Chron. 73; Chron. Lond. 107; Pol. Songs, ii. 136.

¹² Monstr. iii. 343; Rel. inéd. 95.

¹³ In 1425, when he protested his innocence and his statement was accepted by Duke Philip (Juv. 555; St Foix, iii. 237).

scruple to call it a detestable crime¹. Whatever view is taken, however, discussion of the dauphin's personal responsibility is beside the mark. The boy was only sixteen years of age and too young to withstand the machinations of those around him. He doubtless fell in with the scheme of vengeance that others had planned, and when the plot had succeeded was powerless to repudiate it even had he been minded to do so.

As for the victim, men forgot his crimes in the affection born of pity. They called him the "good duke²," the "glorious martyr³," the "only hope for peace⁴." But when they cried for God's mercy on his soul because he had renounced his alliance with the English⁵, they forgot the infamy of his ever having made it.

It is at least certain that not a single Englishman had a hand in the devilry that so opportunely removed the ever shifty duke of Burgundy from King Henry's path. One of the last recorded utterances of the duke was a boast that the world would now soon know which was the stronger man—"Hennatin of Flanders" (himself) or Harry of Lancaster⁶; and when he heard what had happened to Hennatin, Harry at once grasped what the crime meant to himself. He mourned the death of "a good and loyal knight and honourable prince⁷," but he saw that it had put him at the top of his desire, and that now by the help of God and St George he would have the lady Catherine, though every Frenchman should say him nay⁸. The prior of the Charterhouse at Dijon was right when he said more than a hundred years later that through the hole in the duke's skull the English entered into France⁹.

News of the duke's fate was speedily carried to the court at Troyes, his widow at Dijon, his son Philip at Ghent, and the *prévôt* and *échevins* of Paris and other Burgundian towns. At Troyes the guiding spirit was unquestionably Queen Isabel, who on Sept. 20 wrote to King Henry urging him to avenge the death of the duke and asking him to receive representatives who should resume the negotiations broken off at Meulan¹⁰.

¹ At the peace of Arras in 1435 (J. Chartier (Vallet de Viriville), i. 194).

² Bourgeois, 129, 131, 132; Trahisons, 144; Leroux de Lincy, Chants Hist. 19.

³ Chastellain, i. 22, 35; Pastoralet, 835.

⁴ Denifle, Chart. iv. 371.

⁵ Cordeliers, 281.

⁶ Juv. 553, 555; Barante, iii. 292.

⁷ Waurin, ii. 286.

⁸ Ibid.; Chastellain, i. 72.

⁹ The famous remark is said to have been made when in 1521 Francis I was shown the duke's skull while on a visit to Dijon (Courtepée, ii. 253).

¹⁰ Beaucourt, i. 186-189, Meurtre, 226 sqq.; Boutiot, ii. 404.

On Oct. 23 she was treating with Duke Philip on matters so confidential that they could not be put in writing¹. The duchess of Burgundy gave orders that the king and queen should be protected at Troyes², sent ambassadors to put her case against the dauphin before the pope, the cardinals, King Sigismund, and many other potentates in both France and the Empire³, took measures for the defence of the duchy of Burgundy against the dauphinists⁴, wrote repeatedly to the University of Paris to stir it to avenge its benefactor⁵, and in an interview with her son Philip in the following spring urged him to press her demand for justice without remission⁶. Otherwise she seems to have had little share in shaping the course of events.

As for the new duke, Philip, later known as "the Good," when his first transports of grief⁷ were over, he settled down into a fixed determination to exact vengeance for his father's death. He soon became confident that he could count on the support of the principal towns of Flanders and Artois⁸. The most important members of his family—his cousin the duke of Brabant, his uncle John, ex-bishop of Liège, and his aunt Margaret, countess of Hainault—all advised alliance with the English⁹. From Paris came a deputation, headed by Philippe de Morvilliers, First President of the *Parlement*, begging his protection and setting forth the plight of the country. After conversation with them, he promised to take measures to hold his supporters together and to send an embassy to Henry to secure a truce¹⁰. An assembly of leading men and towns of the Burgundian party was summoned to meet at Arras on Oct. 17¹¹.

For Henry, as we have seen, the whole outlook was completely changed by the crime of Montereau, and as soon as Queen Isabel's friendly overtures had been received, the way was open for patching up old quarrels and striving for a lasting agreement. On Sept. 24, Henry, then at Gisors, nominated envoys with full authority to meet the representatives of the king of

¹ Chastellain, i. 70 n.

² Boutiot, ii. 404.

³ La Barre, i. 227; Plancher, iii. 530.

⁴ Ibid. 537.

⁵ Denifle, Chart. iv. 371 sq., 375; Chastellain, i. 68; Plancher, iii. 533.

⁶ Barante, iv. 117.

⁷ These seem to have been violent and genuine (Chastellain, i. 49 sq.).

⁸ Ibid. 64, 67, 68; La Barre, 230.

⁹ Ibid.; Barante, iv. 5

¹⁰ Chastellain, i. 81; Monstr. iii. 359 sq.

¹¹ Ibid. 360; Chastellain, i. 70, 77.

France and arrange conditions of peace¹. The English commissioners were Bishop Kemp, Gilbert Umfraville, and Richard Cowdray, and with them were associated four Frenchmen—Guy le Bouteiller (described as “dominus de la Roche Guyon”), Jean Seignet, Jean Alespe, and Roger Mustel junior, the two first having been concerned in the defence of Rouen. Before they could do much, Duke Philip, on Oct. 1, appointed six representatives to negotiate an alliance with the English².

Their safe-conducts were dated Oct. 9³, and, in company with the count of St Pol, governor of Paris, they were received by Henry at Mantes on Oct. 26⁴. They stated that they had come to open discussion as to an alliance⁵. The king listened in silence to what they had to say, and then, without rising from his seat, addressed them in his old haughty style⁶. He expressed his sorrow at the murder and commended Philip's resolve to take vengeance; but if Philip thought to play on him as his father had done, he must at once disillusion himself, for, come what would, the English would go on with their conquests. There were, he said, at Pontoise envoys from the dauphin waiting for his answer to similar overtures: the people of Paris, as he understood, were ready to call him in: he would give the duke until Martinmas to come into line with them: and if Paris should fall into his hands in the meantime, he would hold himself free to act as he saw fit⁷. On the next day (Oct. 27) the envoys had another interview, in which Henry explained that if he married the princess Catherine, no cost should fall on her relatives⁸, and that he was willing that King Charles should keep his title of king of France and Queen Isabel her estate, provided that immediately on the death of the former, the crown of France should fall to him and his heirs, and that, as Charles was ill, he himself should govern the country in the meanwhile. If the duke of Burgundy would agree to these conditions, Henry would take steps to secure the punishment of the murderers, and would make arrangements for the

¹ Rym. ix. 796 sq.

² Ibid. 828. The commissioners were Martin Porée bishop of Arras, John lord of Thoulougeon, Gilbert de Lannoy (captain of Sluys), Simon de Formelles, who had often been employed before in diplomatic business with England, Henri de Chauffeur, a member of the duke's council, and George of Ostend, the duke's secretary.

³ Rym. ix. 803; Chast. i. 71.

⁴ Ibid. 72 n.; Norm. Chron. (Williams) 196, (Hellot) 52; Kingsford, Lit. 334.

⁵ Chast. i. 71.

⁶ Ibid. 71 sq.; Vita, 238.

⁷ Chast. i. 71 sqq.

⁸ “Sans charge de ses parents.”

marriage of one of his brothers to a sister of the duke. The bishop of Arras urged that these were big questions, and the count of St Pol said that they had no power to deal with them. Henry answered that the duke and King Charles had only to say "Yes" or "No," adding that he was willing to continue negotiations, but that if the duke had any designs on the crown for himself, he would make war upon him to the death, and that he would far rather see the duke of Orléans on the throne than the duke of Burgundy. The bishop of Arras, who drew up a report from which these details are derived¹, says that Henry's words utterly disconcerted the envoys². Some of them who knew him personally spoke with him apart and begged for more friendly treatment or at least another interview. The only concession they obtained, however, was that while some went back to report, the rest might remain at Mantes, provided that the duke did not delay his reply too long.

Meanwhile, on Oct. 17, there had met at Arras an assembly of nobles, captains, clergy, and burghers, who had consented to support the duke in an enterprise which he was about to undertake for the good of the realm, no secret, it seems, being made of his plan of allying with the English³. When, however, the envoys returned from Mantes with their report of Henry's demands, it was thought advisable to take further counsel with a number of lords, spiritual and temporal, who were invited to state their views freely⁴. On behalf of Philip's policy, it was urged that Henry in alliance with him would be able to unite all Frenchmen into a single body, not as his subjects but as his good neighbours; it was also pointed out that the cause of the murdered duke had not yet been taken up by the pope, with whom Henry had great influence, and his friendship would be of much value to the Burgundian interest at the curia⁵. It was contended, on the other hand, that if they did secure him as an ally, there was a risk of his driving out the king, the queen, and all the French people, and bringing over barons, knights and clerks from England to take their place. But these forebodings were disregarded by the "saner part"⁶

¹ Now in the Bibliothèque nationale (Chastellain, i. 72, where no exact reference is given).

² *Ibid.* 75.

⁴ *Monstr.* iii. 362; *Chast.* i. 85.

⁶ *Ibid.* 85. Cf. *Monstr.* iii. 362 sq.

³ *Monstr.* iii. 360 sq.; *Chast.* i. 78.

⁵ *Ibid.* 84 n.

of the meeting, who also rejected a middle course of temporisation and the negotiation of a short truce¹.

Events now moved quickly. On Nov. 7 King Charles gave authority to the duke to conclude in his name a truce or armistice with the English, with whom he purposed to treat for peace². Envoys from the duke went back to Mantes bearing an offer to negotiate on the basis of Henry's terms. They were graciously received, and told that Henry would forthwith send an embassy to Arras to discuss an alliance³. Some of them were ready to leave on Nov. 19⁴, but others remained to conclude an armistice, dated the following day, which created a neutral zone round Paris and practically ended hostilities between English and Burgundians⁵. On Nov. 21 the earl of Warwick, Bishop Kemp, and five others were commissioned to arrange a general truce with the French king⁶. They were received with great distinction by the duke at Arras, and seven days were spent in busy debate⁷, until on Dec. 2 Philip solemnly accepted the terms on which Henry was willing to make peace—namely, that he should marry Catherine, be regent until Charles VI's death, and then become king⁸. On Dec. 7 the duke commissioned the bishop of Arras, Philippe de Morvilliers, and others to negotiate a truce with Henry on behalf of Charles VI and a treaty for himself⁹. The envoys went to Rouen, where on Dec. 24 they concluded a truce between the two kings which was to last till March, the dauphinists not being covered by it¹⁰; and on Christmas Day Henry formally signed a treaty of alliance between himself and Philip. The text stated that the duke had asked for an alliance in order that peace between the realms might be promoted, and that it was understood not only that Henry should marry Catherine but also that one of his brothers should marry a sister of the duke's. The treaty established a mutual defensive alliance. Henry, moreover, would try to secure the punish-

¹ This was urged by Gilbert de Lannoy (Chast. i. 84 n.).

² Rym. ix. 820 sq.

³ Monstr. iii. 363; Chast. i. 85 sq.

⁴ Rym. ix. 811.

⁵ *Ibid.* 812 sq. Originally designed to last till Dec. 4, it was afterwards extended to Dec. 12 (*ibid.* 816). The plenipotentiaries on the English side were Bishop Morgan, Henry Fitzhugh and Walter Hungerford, and on the French side the bishop of Arras, the lord of Courtivron, and Master Jean Doule (*ibid.* 813; cf. 806, 810).

⁶ *Ibid.* ix. 813 sq.

⁷ Monstr. iii. 363; Chastellain, i. 85 sq.

⁸ Tillet, Recueil, 125; Rym. ix. 816, 818.

⁹ *Ibid.* 821, 828 sq.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 822 sq.

ment of the dauphin and his accomplices for the Montereau murder and the grant to the duke by Charles VI of lands worth 20,000 *liv. par.* a year—a gift which he would make himself as soon as he became king if Charles had not already done so¹. The signing of the treaty was followed by a great Christmas feast, at which Henry was extremely merry², as well he might be. On Jan. 5 the agreement was ratified by the duke at Arras³.

In looking for a scape-goat on which to lay the blame for the policy which led to this result, French writers have generally been disposed to be specially severe on Queen Isabel, whose German birth has told heavily against her during the last hundred years. Next to her in order of blame comes Duke Philip, who is denounced for sacrificing his country to his unbridled passion for revenge. But, however culpable the queen and the duke may have been, an equal share of the responsibility must lie with the *Parlement*, the University, and the citizens of Paris. When news of the murder reached the capital, it was received with the utmost consternation and alarm⁴. The populace would probably have massacred every Armagnac but that orders were issued forbidding any man to carry sword or knife⁵. The whole city again donned the badge of the St Andrew's cross⁶—a practice discontinued since the reconciliation of the previous July. Solemn services for the dead duke were held in every church⁷. Many Armagnacs were seized and executed⁸, and the rest were closely watched⁹. A conciliatory manifesto from the dauphin, in which he gave his version of the episode and emphasised the need for peace, was disregarded¹⁰, and at a large meeting those present bound themselves to resist the designs of such as wished to destroy the peace and unity of France—in other words, the dauphin and his party¹¹.

¹ Rym. ix. 825 sqq.

² Norm. Chron. 198.

³ Rym. ix. 842. [The chronology of the negotiations which led to the Anglo-Burgundian alliance is most perplexing. Dr Wylie had not given much thought to it, and for the order of events in the text I alone am responsible.]

⁴ Félibien, iv. 580; Monstr. iii. 355; Waurin, ii. 287 (277).

⁵ St Denys, vi. 374; Longnon, 267.

⁶ Félibien, ii. 798, iv. 580.

⁷ *Ibid.* 798.

⁸ Monstr. iii. 356; cf. Ordonnances, xii. 281.

⁹ J. Chartier (Vallet de Virville), iii. 234; Ordonnances, xii. 272.

¹⁰ Félibien, ii. 797, iv. 580; Monstr. iii. 352 sqq.; Juv. 554; Denifle, Chart. iv. 368; Beaucourt, i. 194.

¹¹ Monstr. iii. 355 sq. Similar meetings were held at Auxerre, Langres, Mâcon, Troyes, and other towns (Plancher, iii. 530).

As we have seen, a deputation headed by the First President of the *Parlement*, soon set out to take counsel with the new duke¹. News of these doings must speedily have been communicated to Henry, for before the end of September, 1419, he despatched the earl of Warwick to Paris with an assurance of his readiness to treat², and the city promptly replied by sending an embassy to the English king³. In the next three months there was much going and coming between king, duke, and city⁴, and Henry afterwards specially recognised the great efforts the Parisians had made to bring about peace⁵.

While diplomacy had been achieving these momentous results, arms, though less effectual, had not been idle. After the fall of Pontoise, Henry had stayed there from Aug. 6 to Aug. 18⁶. He then sent troops northward to clear the country between Pontoise and Gisors. He himself was with them before both Lavillettertre and the neighbouring fortress of Bouconvillers⁷. These places, which are close to Chars, had surrendered before the end of the month. The king's army then moved on for the reduction of Gisors. He arrived before the town on Aug. 31⁸, taking up his quarters at the castle of Trie⁹. On Sept. 11 the town garrison undertook to surrender if not relieved before Sept. 17¹⁰, and, though deemed impregnable, the castle yielded on the 23rd¹¹. From Gisors Henry removed to Mantes, where he remained till late in November¹². Thence he sent out three separate detachments to reduce Meulan, Montjoie, and St Germain. To each of these sieges he paid personal visits, and one after the other the strongholds yielded very soon after operations seriously began. At Meulan, where the castle was situated on an island in the Seine, he began to build timber towers on flat-bottomed boats, the bridge being protected from a boat attack by stakes driven into the bed of the stream. The place, however, surrendered tamely to the earl of March and the Earl Marshal

¹ Chast. i. 81.² St Denys, vi. 378.³ D.K.R. xli. 799.⁴ Rym. ix. 802, 805 sq., 810, 811, 821; Chast. i. 81 n.⁵ Rym. ix. 855.⁶ Tit. Liv. 77; Vita, 232; Gesta, 131.⁷ Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, p. 1, mm. 14, 21.⁸ Tit. Liv. 77; Vita, 233, 235.⁹ Bréquigny, 105 sq.; Delpit, 229; D.K.R. xli. 799, xlii. 325.¹⁰ [Newhall, 141 n., citing Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,043, no. 5419.]¹¹ Vita, 234; Gesta, 131.¹² D.K.R. xli. 800, 803, 807; xlii. 328-331; Bréquigny, 107-111.

by Oct. 30¹. Montjoie and St Germain likewise made little resistance², though on his way to attack the former the duke of Gloucester was held up at the bridge of Poissy and spent seven days reducing the place³. From Mantes the king, towards the end of November, went to the castle at Vernon, where he stayed till the middle of December⁴. While he was at Vernon there occurred the fall of Château Gaillard, which had held out since the previous spring, defying assaults and mines. The dauphinist garrison had made many spirited sorties, and, according to a Burgundian authority, only yielded when their ropes were worn out and they could no longer draw water from the well. The English took possession on Dec. 8, Lord Roos being appointed captain⁵. After leaving Vernon the king made a solemn entry into Rouen, being met at St Paul's church, at the foot of Mont St Catherine, by the clergy of the city, after which he rode through the streets in solemn procession. At the cathedral, where the canons and chaplains met him with their most precious relics, he heard Mass, and then took up his quarters in the castle⁶.

[Henry remained at Rouen for three months. The administration seems to have been working fairly smoothly. The Council and *Échiquier* of Normandy had been established at Rouen, the *chambre des comptes* and the treasury remained at Caen⁷. New *baillis* had been appointed for Caux⁸, Gisors⁹, and Mantes¹⁰ as Henry's conquests extended, and during 1419 the central government had been strengthened by the appointment of a seneschal and a treasurer-general¹¹. The collection of revenue was being accomplished as easily as could be expected. In the fiscal year beginning May 1, 1419, 72,900 *livres tournois* were received under the head of *demesne*, 26,600 from the salt-

¹ D.K.R. xli. 805.

² Tit. Liv. 79; Gesta, 132; Vita, 239.

³ Poissy surrendered between Nov. 7 and 20 (Vallet de Viriville, i. 189). During the siege the king visited the priory, where he was received by the French king's daughter Marie, the prioress, and presented rich gifts to the house (Norm. Chron. [Williams] 196, [Hellot] 53).

⁴ D.K.R. xli. 807, 808, xlii. 331.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 80; Vita, 242 sq.; Monstr. iii. 336 sq.; Norm. Chron. 197; D.K.R. xli. 803. Two authorities—Norm. Chron. (193) and Wals. (ii. 330)—date the fall in September. The former subsequently contradicts itself, the latter is almost certainly confusing Château Gaillard with Gisors.

⁶ Tit. Liv. 81; Vita, 244; Gesta, 133; Cochon, 283.

⁷ See below, ch. LXVII.

⁸ D.K.R. xli. 707.

⁹ Ibid. 754.

¹⁰ Ibid. 769.

¹¹ See below, p. 243.

tax, and 37,800 from the *quartage* on beverages and the sales-tax, or *imposicion foraine*, of one *sou* on the pound of other commodities. The total receipts in money of the Norman treasury exceeded the expenditure—155,300 *liv. tourn.*—by more than 5100 *liv. tourn.*, most of the money disbursed going to the maintenance of the English garrisons¹. All things considered, the financial situation was satisfactory, though it was regrettable that the coins issued by Henry from the mints at Rouen and St Lô were of very poor standard². Still, as long as Charles VI, the dauphin, and the duke of Burgundy continued to strike base coins, it would have been idle for Henry to make good ones³.]

By this time all hope of successful resistance seems to have died out in Normandy, and as the king's stay at Rouen neared its close, an enormous number⁴ of persons received back lands and possessions which had been forfeited since the day when the English landed at Touques. On April 15, 1420, fresh powers were given to the treasurer of Normandy, William Alington, to issue safe-conducts to all who were prepared to come in; and the Norman Rolls record 700 such submissions about this time⁵, and 791 more before the end of the year⁶. At Easter, as a thank-offering for his wonderful success, the king released all prisoners confined in the archbishop's gaol⁷.

¹ Exch. Accts. 187/14.

² On the coinage struck in Normandy by Henry V, see Hewlett, 181 sqq.; Hoffmann, Plate XXIX. The St Lô mint was not re-opened till April, 1420 (Hewlett, 191; Bailhache, 66 sq.).

³ On the general condition of the French coinage at this time, see Dieudonné in *Bibl. Éc. des Chartes*, lxxii. 486 sqq.

⁴ Cf. "fere infiniti," *Rym.* ix. 867.

⁵ *D.K.R.* xlii. 360, 365, 370.

⁶ *Ibid.* 375-404, *passim*.

⁷ *Rym.* ix. 882; *D.K.R.* xlii. 373.

CHAPTER LXIII

THE TREATY OF TROYES

THOUGH the alliance between England and Burgundy was now formally signed, the first attempts at co-operation were far from promising. Even before agreement was reached the two parties had tried to work together. A composite force had attacked the tower of Tremblay, whence the Armagnac garrison escaped by night, and then a quarrel arose as to which part of the attacking force had shown the more bravery. The two contingents consequently separated¹; but such a breach could not be countenanced by Henry, and when a Burgundian force was about to undertake the re-capture of Roze, surprised by the Armagnacs from Compiègne on Dec. 10², the earl of Huntingdon was ordered to put himself at the disposal of the duke of Burgundy for the purpose of aiding the enterprise. Pressed by the Burgundians, the Armagnacs at Roze surrendered in the night of Jan. 18³ to John of Luxemburg, who guaranteed them their lives and granted them a safe-conduct to return to Compiègne. Before they had been an hour on the road, there arrived a force of 2000 English, under the earl of Huntingdon and John Cornwall, intending to take part in the siege. Finding how the case stood, they turned and followed in pursuit, came up with the Armagnacs, who were straggling carelessly, scattered them with great slaughter, and then retired with their prisoners to the village of Amy, between Roze and Lassigny⁴. There John of Luxemburg soon arrived, protesting vehemently against the violation of his safe-conduct. High words followed between the English and Burgundian leaders, John Cornwall even striking Hector de Saveuse on the arm with his mailed fist. In the end the Burgundians had to give way in face of superior numbers; the affront was sugared with good cheer, though it was never really

¹ *Abrégé des grandes Chroniques*, in J. Chartier (Vallet de Virville), iii. 234 sq.

² *Monstr.* iii. 365 sq.; Fenin, 121.

³ *Monstr.* iii. 368; *Abrégé*, in J. Chartier (Vallet de Virville), iii. 235.

⁴ *Monstr.* iii. 368 sq.; *Chast.* i. 97; *Trahisons de France*, 147; Fenin, 123.

forgotten¹. Two of the Armagnac prisoners were actually sent to England and kept there till they had paid a heavy ransom².

After this incident the English commanders went westward, captured the castle of La Fontaine-la-Vaganne near Grandvilliers and laid it in ruins after a three weeks' siege³, and having made an ineffectual attempt on the strong castle of Clermont-en-Beauvaisis⁴, returned to Normandy. As for John of Luxemburg, after placing garrisons at La Fère and Nouvion-le-Comte he went back to his castle of Beaufort near St Quentin⁵. If these operations brought little glory to the English, still worse was their fortune at sea, for in January a Castilian fleet appeared before La Rochelle, where it engaged and defeated an English naval force, destroying or capturing many ships, killing 700 men, and taking many prisoners, some of whom were landed at the town and slaughtered by the Bastard of Alençon⁶.

That the high-handed insolence of the English at Roze did not cause a rupture of their alliance with the Burgundians is a measure of the value of their support to Duke Philip. It would be folly to let a single regrettable incident prevent the fulfilment of the purpose of all his doings since his father's death. Both Henry and the duke now began to exploit the alliance according to their respective aims. Thus, on Jan. 17 a proclamation was issued at Troyes in which King Charles directly charged the dauphin with the murder at Montreuil, called upon Frenchmen to pay no heed to his commands nor to regard him as lord of any lands in France, and declared him unworthy to be heir to the French crown, adding that the king's troops would now sweep the country and render life and property secure⁷. On Jan. 24 King Henry, in response to a petition from the citizens of Paris, assured them that there should be no interference with their rights after he succeeded to the throne of France⁸. The truce with Charles VI was prolonged from time to time, until on April 24 it was announced that it should

¹ Chast. i. 97, 99, 101; Trahisons, 146; Fenin, 124.

² Monstr. iii. 371; Chast. i. 97, 102.

³ Monstr. iii. 372; Waurin, ii. 295; Chast. i. 103.

⁴ Ibid. 105.

⁵ Ibid. 102; Monstr. iii. 371.

⁶ Juv. 556; St Denys, vi. 398; Circourt, 353, 373; Beaucourt, i. 312.

⁷ Ordonnances, xii. 276 sq.

⁸ Rym. ix. 854; D.K.R. xlii. 338.

last until eight days after denunciation by either party¹. In February the duke officially announced his negotiations with the English, and then moved southwards, being joined near Bapaume by several thousand fighting men² and at St Quentin by the earl of Warwick, the Earl Marshal, Lord Roos, Gilbert Umfraville, and Lewis Robsart, who came as representatives of the English king, with an escort of 200 lances and 300 archers³. Nearly a fortnight was spent near Laon while the Burgundians reduced the castle of Crépy-en-Laonnais, whence a garrison of 500 Armagnacs had been harrying the district⁴. Then, encountering but little opposition, the force passed through Laon, Rheims, and Châlons⁵, and, amid boisterous shouts of welcome, entered Troyes on March 23⁶. Next day Duke Philip was received with great ceremony by the king and queen, who had hitherto been unable to leave the city for fear of the Armagnac bands in the neighbourhood⁷. There followed several conferences, attended not only by the English envoys but also by seven masters from the University of Paris⁸. The issue was already cut and dried; no difficulty was apprehended; and there were only points of detail to settle⁹. On April 9, 1420, the fateful document was drawn up¹⁰. It was agreed that Henry should marry Catherine without imposing any burden on her parents or the French and that she should receive the usual dowry of an English queen—40,000 crowns a year. He would suffer Charles and Isabel to retain the state and dignity of king and queen of France; for the rest of Charles's life, he would never style himself king of France, and in places subject to the French crown all writs and grants of privileges, pardons, offices, or benefices should be drawn in Charles's name. Immediately after Charles's death, however, the crown of France should belong to Henry, to pass to his heirs for ever; and in the meanwhile, seeing that Charles's health was bad, the

¹ Rym. ix. 857 sq., 864, 874, 889. It had been extended to cover the sea from Flanders to Caen (*ibid.* 852 sq.).

² Monstr. iii. 374, 377; Waurin, ii. 298 (287).

³ Rym. ix. 890; Worcester, *Itin.* 352; Le Fèvre, i. 383; Waurin, ii. 296 (286). Robsart had been sent in January on a mission to the dowager duchess of Burgundy (*Chast.* i. 117).

⁴ Monstr. iii. 374 sqq.; Waurin, ii. 297; *Chast.* i. 105, 111; St Denys, vi. 394; *Abrégé*, in J. Chartier (*Vallet de Viriville*), iii. 236.

⁵ Monstr. iii. 377; *Chast.* i. 113.

⁶ Boutiot, ii. 412; Waurin, ii. 298 (287); Le Fèvre, i. 383.

⁷ Bourgeois, 134.

⁸ Denifle, *Chart.* iv. 379.

⁹ *Chast.* i. 116.

¹⁰ Rym. ix. 877 sqq.

regency should be exercised by Henry, with the counsel of the nobles and wise men of France. He would strive to reduce to obedience all France then subject to the dauphin, especially those parts to the right of the Loire; all his conquests over the dauphinists outside Normandy should be to the advantage of the French crown, and on his becoming king, Normandy and all his other conquests in France should be subject to it¹. Persons in territory conquered by Henry, if obedient to Charles and willing to swear to the Treaty, should be restored to their possessions, unless Henry had already granted them to others. Henry would appoint good and fit officers to govern the kingdom, rule it according to existing laws and customs, maintain the *Parlement* in its authority and all churches, colleges, and universities in their privileges.

These conditions were to be sworn to by all the nobles, lords (both lay and spiritual), universities, colleges, cities, and towns of France. It was further agreed that a personal meeting for the formal interchange of letters patent confirming these terms should take place between King Henry and King Charles, with the queen and the duke of Burgundy, at some place between Nogent-sur-Seine and Troyes and not more than eighteen miles from the latter. Each side might bring 2500 armed men, the English being allowed to occupy Provins, Nogent, and either Lagny-sur-Marne or Charenton before the meeting, on the understanding that they would depart as soon as the treaty was signed. The French king agreed to remain at Troyes till July 1 to give time for everything to be carried out.

On April 13 seven envoys² were despatched to communicate further with King Henry. Taking Paris on their way, they addressed a large meeting in the *Parlement* chamber in the Palace on April 29. The room was packed with representatives of the *Parlement*, the administrative departments, the University, the chapter of Notre Dame, and the civic authorities of Paris, besides many private citizens; and when the spokesman, Jean le Clerc, explained to them the terms that had been provisionally drawn up and asked if they agreed, the whole assembly

¹ The clauses about the status of Henry's conquests are vague and indeed ambiguous, and suggest that it was not possible to reach agreement about the limits of the area over which Henry was at once to exercise sovereign authority.

² They were Lourdin lord of Savigny, Hue de Lannoy, Jean lord of Mesnil, Masters Jean le Clerc and Pierre de Marigny, with Jean de Rinel and Jean Milet, two of the king's secretaries (Rym. ix. 885; Boutiot, ii. 413, 425).

shouted "Yes¹." Fortified with this demonstration of unanimity, and accompanied by the chancellor of France (Eustache de l'Aître), the First President of the *Parlement* (Philippe de Morvilliers), and Guillaume le Clerc, they passed on next day to interview Henry at Pontoise². Back again in Paris, they were asked to describe this conquering Englishman, and they expatiated on his handsome face, his medium height, and his haughty bearing at his first entry, which changed to kindness and affability as the talk proceeded. They found him frank and open, but sparing of words, with his mind fully made up on certain points. What struck them greatly was the strict discipline he enforced on his men: he would have no prostitutes about his camp as the French did. If reverses came he kept an even mind, for the only way to command fortune is to keep a steady heart through all. Very notable was the favour he showed to churchmen, especially to those who conducted his daily services. With such a prince they might at least be sure that if he promised help he meant to give it³. And it was indeed help that Paris then needed. For on the northern and western sides the city was beset by the English, whose savagery was outdone by the Armagnacs who ravaged the country on the south⁴. Food and fuel could only be got into the city at night and under escort⁵. The price of corn had risen to famine height⁶, and at Easter no fresh meat was to be had⁷. Thus the populace was daily becoming more eager for their rulers to come to terms with the English⁸.

Henry, having left Rouen towards the end of March, spent some time at Mantes, and in the last week of April moved on to Pontoise⁹, where he received the envoys from Troyes. Meanwhile, however, the English representatives at Troyes, with the exception of Lewis Robsart, had returned to the king to report¹⁰, and on April 28 a new commission, consisting of the earl of Warwick, Bishop Kemp, Lord Roos, Gilbert Umfraville, and William

¹ Fauquembergue, i. 358 sqq.; Denifle, Chart. iv. 378; Cosneau, 101; Félibien, ii. 799.

² Rym. ix. 891; Fauquembergue, i. 362.

³ St Denys, vi. 380.

⁴ Bourgeois, 131, 135 sqq.; St Denys, vi. 390, 396; Juv. 556.

⁵ Bourgeois, 135, 143; St Denys, vi. 396.

⁶ Juv. 556; Félibien, ii. 798.

⁷ Bourgeois, 138.

⁸ Chast. i. 81.

⁹ D.K.R. xlii. 367 sqq.

¹⁰ Chast. i. 117 n.; Le Fèvre, i. 384; Waurin, ii. 300 (288). They left Troyes on April 17. Robsart stayed to attend upon the princess Catherine.

Porter, together with Dr Thomas Brons and Richard Cowdray, king's secretary, was sent back to Troyes to witness the taking of the oath to observe the agreement by the king, the queen, and the duke of Burgundy, and to make final arrangements for the conference¹. Then, on May 8², accompanied by a large force³, Henry set out on his memorable journey to Troyes. Avoiding towns, the English camped at night⁴, and moved in fighting order through the day, for the Armagnacs were on the watch and boasted that they meant to fight⁵. Both then and afterwards it struck observers as strange⁶ that Henry should have agreed to travel so far into the heart of France instead of insisting that his bride should be brought to him. Some said that it was because of Charles VI's madness: but this had not prevented the meeting at Meulan in the previous year. Others explained that it was not safe for Charles and his queen and daughter to journey out for fear of the dauphinists, of which there were said to be 14,000 within a short distance of Troyes. Others again believed that there was a plot to entrap the English king; but if so, it altogether failed. On the first night the English force halted at St Denis, and Henry made a visit of devotion to the abbey⁷. Next day (May 9) they marched in fighting order close under the walls of Paris, where the citizens on the battlements watched them file proudly past the Porte St Martin, the king's tilting helm being borne before him with the fox's brush embroidered on his device⁸. The sight gave them great delight⁹, and in spite of the dearth in the city, the Parisians managed to send him out four carts loaded with their very best wine; but Henry received the present with his usual lofty indifference¹⁰. Marching on he reached Charenton, where he spent the night. He now proceeded to Provins, leaving at Charenton a small force under William Gascoigne to keep open the passage of the Marne¹¹. He met with some

¹ Rym. ix. 890.

² Tit. Liv. 82; Vita, 249; Gesta, 135; Fenin, 138.

³ Contemporary estimates of their numbers vary greatly. Waurin gives 15,000, mostly archers (ii. 304 [291]); others put the number of archers at 7000 (Bourgeois, 139). Monstrelet says that there were 16,000 fighting men with Henry (iii. 388).

⁴ St Denys, vi. 408.

⁵ Bourgeois, 140.

⁶ The explanations are discussed in Vita, 248, the writer adding that he does not altogether believe any of them.

⁷ Wals. ii. 334.

⁸ Tit. Liv. 82; Chast. i. 130; Bourgeois, 139.

⁹ Wals. ii. 334.

¹⁰ Bourgeois, 139; Félibien, ii. 799.

¹¹ Monstr. iii. 388; Cordeliers, 285; Wals. ii. 334.

resistance as he passed through Brie; but he beat it down by a vigorous assault on one of the opposing castles, hanged some of the defenders, and carried others with him as captives¹; and so he arrived at Provins on May 14². He notified his willingness to attend at the rendezvous within the stipulated three days; but by the 19th³ it was arranged that the meeting should take place at Troyes itself, and thither the army moved on. They crossed the Seine by the bridge at Nogent⁴, and as they neared the walls of Troyes, the duke of Burgundy, attended by many bishops and a throng of citizens, came out to meet them⁵. The duke saluted respectfully without dismounting, and amid shouts of welcome the two rode on chatting together to the hostel appointed for Henry in the city⁶.

Arrangements had been made for the English troops to be quartered in a portion of the city by themselves in view of the possibility of collisions with the French; but the part allotted to them proved to be not nearly large enough, and many had to be billeted in the villages round about⁷. Always on the alert against the demoralisation of his men, Henry issued an order⁸ that none were to drink the strong and heady wine for which Champagne had long been famous without mixing it with water, and the fact that the order was obeyed by so drunken a set as the English troops is striking testimony to the strength of his personal control over the army.

After escorting Henry to his hostel, the duke of Burgundy rode on to announce the arrival to Charles VI at the palace of the Counts on the river bank. Henry himself followed soon afterwards. The poor invalid was seated on the dais of the great hall, which was thronged with lords and courtiers. As soon as he set foot within the door Henry doffed his cap, but Charles showed no sign of recognition. Henry then walked firmly up the floor; and the tension became extreme as Charles remained apathetic. When, however, the English king reached the edge of the dais, Charles raised himself a very little, while Henry bent his knee and uttered some gracious and humble words. His demeanour was a most favourable surprise to the bystanders; but the king paid little heed and merely said,

¹ Tit. Liv. 82; Vita, 250.

² Ibid. 894.

³ Chast. i. 130; Monstr. iii. 388 sq.; Vita, 250.

⁴ Tit. Liv. 83; Vita, 250.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 83; Vita, 251.

⁶ Rym. ix. 893.

⁷ Kingsford, Lit. 335; Vita, 250.

⁸ Tit. Liv. 83; Vita, 250.

⁹ Tit. Liv. 83; Trahisons, 155.

"Oh, it's you? You're very welcome since it is so! Greet the ladies¹." Every one was relieved that a distressing contretemps had thus been averted, for Charles was at the time "in his malady²," and Henry himself must have been glad to obey the king and turn to the queen and her daughter. The queen raised him when he knelt before her, and kissed him. Then, turning to Catherine, he bowed low and kissed her with "great joy," and the three talked pleasantly together for a short time³, after which Henry returned to his hostel for the night.

Next day, May 21, the councils of the two kings and the duke deliberated together, and the treaty was finally sealed in the cathedral⁴. Substantially it corresponded to the terms agreed upon in April⁵. The marriage of Henry and Catherine, however, is treated as settled, and Henry promises that he will try to secure for her the sum of 40,000 crowns a year from England during her widowhood, should she survive him, while the French undertake to provide 20,000 in that contingency⁶. It was agreed that Burgundians whose property had been confiscated and given away by Henry should be compensated from territory thereafter to be conquered from the dauphinists⁷. In an entirely new clause it is laid down that Henry shall strive to secure from the "Three Estates" of both England and France an ordinance that from the time when he shall become king, the crowns shall be united in the same person, each realm, however, retaining its own laws and neither being subject to the other⁸. There is to be perpetual peace, defensive alliance, and freedom of trade (subject to customs duties) between the two kingdoms. Allies of either side who shall give their assent to the treaty within eight months may enjoy such of its benefits as affect them⁹. Neither Charles, Henry, nor the duke of Burgundy shall enter into any negotiations for peace with the

¹ "Or ca vous! Soyez le tres bien venu, puisque ainsy est! Saluez les dames," Chast. i. 131; Boutiot, ii. 426.

² *Ibid.*; Norm. Chron. (Williams) 199, (Hellot) 56; La Marche, i. 85.

³ Chast. i. 133.

⁴ Rym. ix. 904, x. 15, 30; D.K.R. xlii. 374; Tit. Liv. 85; Vita, 252; Wals. ii. 334; Kingsford, Chron. 127, Lit. 335; Fenin, 138.

⁵ For the text of the treaty in Latin and French, see Rym. ix. 895 sqq.; Ordonnances, xi. 86 sqq. The Latin text is also given in St Denys, vi. 410 sqq.; Vita, 253 sqq.; Gesta, 137 sqq. The French text is given, e.g. in Cosneau, Traités, 102 sqq.; Godefroy, Charles VI, 696; Barante, iv. 17 sqq.; Monstr. iii. 390 sqq.; Le Fèvre, ii. 3 sqq.; Waurin, ii. 304. The English text is in Rym. ix. 916; Greg., Chron. 128 sqq.

⁶ Rym. ix. 896, 916 sq.

⁷ *Ibid.* 900, 918 sq.

⁸ *Ibid.* 901 sq., 919.

⁹ *Ibid.* 902, 919 sq.

dauphin, save with the consent of all and also of the Three Estates of both France and England¹.

Charles was not personally present, and the queen and the duke were authorised to act on his behalf². The treaty was sworn to, not only by them and Henry, but also by a number of prelates, lords, and other notable Frenchmen³. It was at once proclaimed in both French and English⁴, and published throughout the city and in the English army. An order was put forth in the name of the French king requiring all his subjects to submit to it⁵. On the following day (May 22) the First President of the *Parlement* of Paris, the bishop and the *bailli* of Troyes, the abbots of Montier-la-Celle, St Loup, and St Martin-ès-Airés, the deans of the churches of St Paul, St Stephen, and St Urban at Troyes, the archdeacon of Sézanne, eleven priests, forty-seven lawyers, and about 1500 of the leading inhabitants met in St Paul's church, and swore on the gospels to observe it⁶. Henry wrote on the same day to Duke Humphrey and the Council in England, enclosing a copy of the treaty, announcing that it had been signed and would bring "perpetual peace," and requiring that the terms of it should be proclaimed throughout the country⁷, with his new title of "king of England, heir and regent of France, and lord of Ireland," which was also to be engraved "on the scripture of our seals," with the exception of the word "regent⁸," for which there was probably not sufficient room. On May 24 Henry despatched Ralph Cromwell and William Swinburne, together with a secretary, Richard Cowdray, to announce the terms of the peace in Paris, where it was proclaimed on May 27⁹. Next day there were processions and a solemn thanksgiving, and on May 30 the treaty was publicly read and registered in the *Parlement* of Paris, where the officers of the *Parlement*, of the University, and of the City came up one by one and had the oath administered to them by the First President¹⁰. All hands were upraised to Heaven in transports of joy¹¹; but by way of extra caution the English envoys, being

¹ Rym. ix. 903, 920.

² Ibid. 894, 906; Félibien, ii. 799, iv. 584; Kingsford, Lit. 335.

³ Leibnitz, Codex, i. 332 sqq.; Rym. ix. 904.

⁴ Vita, 267.

⁵ Ordonnances, xii. 284.

⁶ Rym. ix. 905 sq.

⁷ Ibid. 906 sqq.

⁸ Ibid. 906, 915.

⁹ Ibid. 910, 911.

¹⁰ Ibid. 911; Ordonnances, xii. 284; Denifle, Chart. iv. 380; Cosneau, 102; G. Picot, États Généraux, i. 298.

¹¹ St Denys, vi. 432.

uncertain of their French¹, asked the First President to translate what was being said. Further official publications took place at the Châtelet on June 1, in the church of St Mathurin before the university faculties of theology, law, and medicine on June 3, and before the Rector of the University and the proctors of the four nations on June 4². In London it was proclaimed on June 14, when there was a solemn procession to St Paul's and a sermon at Paul's Cross³.

Meanwhile, another step had been taken towards Henry's complete triumph. On the day on which the treaty was signed, he was solemnly betrothed to the princess Catherine in the cathedral of Troyes⁴, and thenceforth he spoke of Charles VI as "our father" and Catherine as "our wife⁵," though the actual marriage did not take place for another twelve days. The interval was occupied by festivities, banquet following banquet and gift being answered with gift⁶. On Trinity Sunday, June 27, the marriage ceremony was performed with great pomp. To reconstruct the scene is difficult; for the great market-place, which Henry had to cross from his hostel on the western side⁸ to the parish church of St Jean opposite⁹, has since been covered with narrow streets. The church, too, has been much altered, the east end having been rebuilt after a great fire early in the sixteenth century and the west end partly concealed by a porch in the most debased Renaissance style. Only the ill-proportioned nave, dating from the fourteenth century, remains substantially as it was when Henry passed up it to the high altar. It was agreed that the ceremony should be "according to the French custom¹⁰." The coach of the bride and her mother was drawn by eight snow-white English hobbies,

¹ Félibien, ii. 799, iv. 584.

² Ordonnances, xi. 90; Cosneau, 115; Denifle, Chart. iv. 380.

³ Wals. ii. 335. The treaty was accepted by Sigismund at Prague on July 31, and he desired to be included in it as an ally of England (Rym. x. 14). Lewis Count Palatine of the Rhine accepted it on the same date as "alligatus et confederatus" (ibid. 15).

⁴ Rym. ix. 907; Félibien, iv. 584; Boutiot, ii. 426; Fenin, 136; Norm. Chron. (Hellot) 59; Wals. ii. 334; Vita, 252; Chron. Lond. 161; Greg., Chron. 128; Kingsford, Chron. 127; Short Chron. 56.

⁵ Rym. ix. 906; Gesta, 137.

⁶ St Denys, vi. 410.

⁷ Rym. ix. 910; Bourgeois, 140; Norm. Chron. (Hellot) 59; Juv. 557; Cosneau, 103; Chast. i. 133; Kingsford, Chron. 73, Lit. 289; Capgr., De Illustr. 123.

⁸ Chast. i. 115 n., 133.

⁹ The marriage took place here because Henry's hostel lay in the parish of St Jean (Monstr. iii. 389; Waurin, ii. 303 (291); Le Fèvre, ii. 2; Chast. i. 134; Vita, 267; Pol. Songs, ii. 137). For an account of the church, see Grosley, Éphém. ii. 235.

¹⁰ Juv. 557; Monstr. 479; Le Fèvre, ii. 1; Chast. i. 133.

a gift of the bridegroom, and preceded by numerous minstrels¹. The numbers of those admitted to the church were restricted²; but to left and right were ranged tokens of the vast wealth of England and Flanders³, the only sombre touch being afforded by the duke of Burgundy, who was clad in black from head to foot⁴. The ceremony was performed by Henri de Savoisy, archbishop of Sens⁵; the royal couple offered three nobles each with the candle⁶; and instead of the customary thirteen pence, the bridegroom put thirteen nobles on the book, and gave 200 more to the church. The day ended with the wine-cup and the blessing of the bed⁷.

¹ Chast. i. 134 n.; Trahisons, 156.

² Ibid.

³ Monstrelet (iii. 389 sq.) gives a list of the notable Burgundians present.

⁴ Chast. i. 134.

⁵ Juv. 557; Stone, 19.

⁶ Juv. 557.

⁷ "Les soupes au vin et la licit beni," Juv. 557; Trébuchet, 99; Grosley, Éphém. ii. 240, Mém. i. 305.

CHAPTER LXIV

THE DAUPHINIST RESISTANCE

By one of the clauses of the treaty of Troyes King Henry had undertaken to reduce all cities and other places in France that were disobedient to his "father," "beying...of that Partye comonely called Dalphin or Ermynak¹." At Troyes the streets had resounded with merriment since the day of his betrothal, and on the day after the wedding² he gave a "royal and passing solemn feast" to the great lords, with plenty of entertainment for the populace³. The general expectation of more jousts and festivities was, however, disappointed; for Henry announced that such things must now cease, and that he would start early next day for real warfare, where those eager for tourneys might display their hardihood as they would, seeing that there was no prowess in the world equal to doing justice on malefactors and helping the poor to live⁴. Catherine was to go with him; perhaps because he had married her "without charge to her parents," he appointed the officers of her household, not one of whom was a Frenchman, though she was allowed three French ladies and two French maids to wait upon her⁵. The king and queen were to go too, and many English and French ladies.

Early on June 4⁶ the army accordingly left Troyes. The two kings rode together, with the duke of Burgundy at their side⁷. The operations of Burgundian columns had already to a great extent cleared the country near Troyes⁸, and little opposition was to be apprehended as the force crossed the forest of Othe. A body of troops was left to reduce Villeneuve l'Archevêque, which was still in Armagnac hands⁹, and the main army

¹ Rym. ix. 917. Though previously the party opposed to the Burgundians had been generally known as "Armagnacs," henceforth the fashion set in to call them "Dauphinists," either with or without the old title as an alternative.

² Brut, ii. 425; Boutiot, ii. 433.

³ Fenin, 137.

⁴ Bourgeois, 140.

⁵ Wals. ii. 335.

⁶ Rym. ix. 910; Vita, 268; Gesta, 142.

⁷ Chast. i. 138.

⁸ Details of their operations are given in Chast. i. 117 n., 118, 121, 124, 126; Monstr. iii. 380 sq., 382 sq.; Fenin, 129, 131; Trahisons, 152, 153.

⁹ The place was reduced by the lord of L'Isle Adam on June 7, the garrison, it is said, being in terror of a celebrated gun called *Passe-volant*, which wrought great destruction with its first and only shot (Trahisons, 157, 158).

marched to Sens¹. Here they found the bridges cut and the suburbs destroyed. The siege began on June 5², and in a letter written next day³ by an Englishman in the camp, Sens is described as "a great town and a notable, holden strong with great number of Ermynaks." But the townsmen were in no mood for resistance⁴; the garrison made little stand⁵; and after about a week⁶ an unkempt, unshaven man came out to parley. John Cornwall, who had been commissioned to treat with the defenders, would not see him at first, saying that he must have his beard trimmed before he could be heard⁷. Nevertheless Sens surrendered on June 11⁸, and as Henry rode into the city with his queen, he turned gaily to the archbishop saying, "You have given me my bride; I now give you yours⁹." The garrison were forced to don the St Andrew's cross and to swear not to serve in future against the duke of Burgundy; but many of them, as soon as they were out of danger, made straight for Montereau to join the dauphinists there¹⁰.

Henry's army moved northward without delay. At Bray, where the English arrived by June 16, King Charles and the ladies were left behind¹¹, as rough work was expected at Montereau. A force of Burgundians was detached to effect the conquest of several places in Brie, between Bray and Melun, a task which was accomplished without much trouble, the garrisons surrendering readily to the lord of L'Isle Adam, who was in command, because he was their "neighbour" and more to be trusted than English, Picards, or Burgundians¹². On the 16th the main force arrived at Montereau¹³. The sight of the scene of the murder of Duke John inflamed them to a fury. Montereau was reputed to be so strong that a handful of men might hold

¹ For documents dated at Sens on June 4, 6, 9, 12, see Rym. ix. 913; D.K.R. xlii. 388, 389.

² Rym. ix. 910.

³ *Ibid.* 910. The writer was John Ofort, of whom nothing more is known. It is possible that he is to be identified with John Offord, a clerk of the king's signet under Henry IV (Cal. Pat. Hen. IV, ii. 264, iii. 20, 113) and clerk of the privy seal in Normandy in 1420 (Claus. 8 Hen. V, 18, May 3, 1420).

⁴ St Denys, vi. 442; Juv. 557 sq.

⁵ Tit. Liv. 89, though in Vita, 269, hard and repeated assaults are mentioned.

⁶ Vita, 269.

⁷ Fenin, 138.

⁸ Juv. 558; Bourgeois, 140.

⁹ Juv. 558.

¹⁰ Monstr. iii. 403; Chast. i. 141.

¹¹ Rym. ix. 920, 921; Le Fèvre, ii. 13; Waurin, ii. 322 (307); Norm. Chron. (Williams) 201, (Hellot) 60.

¹² Trahisons, 158.

¹³ Gesta, 143; Vita, 271.

it against the world; but on June 24 a small scaling party got across the moat and rushed the walls. The town was then carried by assault and the garrison driven helter-skelter across the bridge to the castle on the tongue of land at the confluence of the Yonne and the Seine¹. The victors made their way to the parish church², where Duke John had been buried. At his son's command, some knights and squires lifted the coffin from the earth, and not one of those present could restrain his tears as he gazed on the face of the dead man, looking, as he did, but little altered. The body was laid in another coffin packed with salt and spices for removal to a more honourable home in the Charterhouse at Dijon³.

Henry and Duke Philip transferred their headquarters to the right bank of the Yonne, and planted their big guns⁴ to beset the castle, strengthening their communications by throwing a temporary bridge across the Seine⁵. In the rush that followed the seizure of the town eleven gentlemen had been captured, and Henry threatened to hang them all if they did not bring about the surrender of the castle⁶. Kneeling on the edge of the ditch, they implored the defenders to capitulate as they knew that their case was hopeless, while their own lives would be forfeit if the garrison held out. But the captain, Guillaume de Chaumont, lord of Guitry⁷, told them that if a man is taken in war he is under sentence, and they must take their chance⁸. Then they prayed that they might see their wives, children, and kinsfolk before they died, and firing ceased as these mounted to the battlements to wave a farewell. On the morrow a gibbet was set up and all were hanged in full view of the castle walls. It is notable that no one blamed Henry; indeed, what most struck contemporaries was his strict justice in hanging on the same gibbet a favourite groom, who usually held his horse's rein, for killing an English knight⁹. It is the captain of the castle who in contemporary opinion was culpable for holding out when he knew his situation was hopeless¹⁰; and

¹ Monstr. iii. 403 sq.; Waurin, ii. 318 (304); Le Fèvre, ii. 10; Fenin, 140; Chast. i. 142.

² Monstr. iii. 404; Chast. i. 144.

³ Ibid.; Monstr. iii. 404; Fenin, 141; Trahisons, 158.

⁴ "Force et multitudes d'engins," Chast. i. 146.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Fenin, 140, 141; cf. Monstr. iii. 404; Le Fèvre, ii. 12; Chast. i. 146.

⁷ Ibid. 141, 146; Bourgeois, 141; Juv. 561.

⁸ "Es faits de guerre ne gist qu'un hasart; qui est pris, il est attainé," Chast. i. 146.

⁹ Ibid.; Fenin, 142; Monstr. iii. 406.

¹⁰ Chast. i. 148; Fenin, 141.

indeed it soon appeared that the lives of the prisoners had been needlessly thrown away, for on July 1¹ the castle surrendered, and the garrison of 500 men², including a number of Scots³, were suffered to depart in safety, a humiliating anti-climax for which they received no praise from friend or foe⁴.

After a short stay at Montereau, during which measures were taken for victualling and garrisoning the place⁵, King Henry moved down the Seine for the reduction of Melun. At Sens and Montereau the garrisons had used brave words which had no backing from the townsmen. But at Melun Henry's calculations were altogether at fault, for the place made a heroic stand for over four months. The town may be regarded as divided into three parts by the Seine. The most populous portion—the quarter of St Aspais—was on the north bank, and was enclosed by strong walls. On the opposite shore was the extensive suburb of St Ambroise, containing the citadel, while between the two in mid-stream lay the long island of St Étienne, on the north shore of which stood the castle. Each of these three parts was enclosed with a wall, and the three were connected by a long bridge, which stretched from bank to bank and bisected the island. The siege began on July 13⁶, and probably for reasons of policy the English and the Burgundians were kept almost entirely apart, the English being for the most part encamped on the flat ground on the south bank towards the Gâtinais, and the Burgundians on the north towards Brie⁷, though the earls of Warwick and Huntingdon were stationed on this side to assist, and perhaps in reality to control, the duke of Burgundy⁸. For the Burgundians the siege opened fiercely. One of their captains in defiance planted his banner in front of a bulwark built near the abbey of St Père, and on the very first day the garrison sallied out and captured it⁹. Soon afterwards, however, a party of English, supported by Savoyards, Picards, and Burgundians, made a desperate rush and took a strong outpost constructed by the defenders on the outer side of the moat¹⁰, and held it tenaciously throughout the siege, though it cost them many lives both to capture and to retain it. Among the Englishmen who fell at this point was Philip Leche, who

¹ Bourgeois, 141 n.

³ Vita, 270.

⁵ Monstr. iii. 406; Waurin, ii. 322.

⁷ Norm. Chron. (Hellot) 61; Tit. Liv. 89; Vita, 277.

⁸ Ibid. 278.

¹⁰ Monstr. iii. 410 sq.; Waurin, ii. 327; Le Fèvre, ii. 16; Chast. i. 154; Trahisons, 159.

² St Denys, vi. 458.

⁴ Juv. 558.

⁶ Vita, 277; Gesta, 145.

⁹ Fenin, 143; Trahisons, 159.

had earned the high opinion of the duke of Burgundy for his soldierly qualities¹.

After this incident both sides settled down to the orthodox routine of a siege. Each section of the attacking force was entrenched within a strongly fortified enclosure² surrounded with a ditch and palisade and approached through four entrances, which were heavily barricaded and guarded night and day³; communication between the several camps was kept up by means of a temporary bridge across the Seine⁴. The defence was in the hands of a Gascon, Arnaud Guillaume, lord of Barbazan⁵, with a force of only 600 or 700 men, including many townfolk⁶. Outside the place great efforts had been made to collect a relieving force, and some 16,000 men were actually assembled in the neighbourhood of Châteaurenard, near Montargis, about thirty miles away; but spies who penetrated to the English lines reported them to be so strong that an attack would have no chance of success⁷; and the Armagnacs therefore resolved to play a waiting game and to avoid a battle in the open⁸, though harassing attacks on the besieging army were constantly kept up, both from the south-west and from the Armagnac garrisons at Meaux and other places in Brie and Champagne.

At the beginning of the siege the English were reinforced by 800 men-at-arms and 2000 archers under the duke of Bedford, who had crossed from England to Normandy in April and May⁹. About the same time Henry's brother-in-

¹ Monstr. iii. 411; Fenin, 143.

² Juv. 558; Monstr. iii. 411; Waurin, ii. 327.

³ Fenin, 143.

⁴ Vita, 278; Monstr. iii. 411; Chast. i. 155, who says that it was "passable a pied et a cheval."

⁵ St Denys, vi. 446; Juv. 558; Waurin, ii. 301 (289); Le Fèvre, i. 385; Fenin, 145; Trahisons, 159; Tit. Liv. 89.

⁶ Monstr. iii. 410. Among the defenders was Louis Juvénel des Ursins, brother of the chronicler, from whom probably came the story of the Austin friar who picked off sixty lances with his crossbow, not to mention lesser game (Juv. 558, 559 sq.).

⁷ Ordonnances, xi. 103; Juv. 558; cf. Vita, 282.

⁸ Fenin, 139.

⁹ Monstr. iii. 407; Waurin, ii. 323 (307); Chast. i. 149; Ordonnances, xii. 285. Bedford arrived at Rouen on April 18 (Cochon, 283). His own retinue consisted of 120 men-at-arms and 360 archers. With him, or a little later, arrived other contingents, which brought the force up to a strength of 299 and 897 (Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Pasch., May 9, 1420). The remainder of the troops which he brought to Melun seem to have sailed about the middle of May (see the duke of Gloucester's letter to Henry, printed in Kluge, 51, from H. James, Facsimiles of the National MSS. pt. 1, no. xxxvi). [There is still extant a muster roll, dated May 6, of 282 men-at-arms and 993 archers about to sail to France (Newhall, 208, n. 7, citing Exch. Accts. 49/36). Professor Newhall's investigations have led him to conclude that the reinforcements sent from England in 1420 numbered altogether some 2200 men.]

law, Lewis Count Palatine of the Rhine¹, came from Germany with 700 men, whose wages were paid by Henry². James king of Scots was also present³; he was brought from his English prison, not to add to Henry's prestige in French eyes, but for a purpose which only became evident at the end of the siege. Charles VI and the ladies remained at Corbeil⁴, about six miles away, while the duke of Burgundy withdrew at intervals to divert himself at the castle of Blandy, six miles or so to the east⁵. Henry often went over to Corbeil⁶; but when the siege had been in progress for some time he had a house built and furnished near his tent, and there Catherine stayed for a month⁷. Every day at sunrise and sunset eight or ten English minstrels, with horns and other instruments, entertained her with sweet music for about an hour⁸.

It must not be supposed, however, that Henry allowed his attention to be diverted from his military obligations. Throughout he took a very active share in the direction of the siege⁹. The Anglo-Burgundian force was provided with guns of exceptional size, which played upon the walls night and day¹⁰; but the besieged showed extraordinary energy in making up the gaps with barrels filled with earth, timber, or refuse¹¹. The besiegers also mined beneath the moat, but the defenders heard them and countermined. When the two sides met with only a breastwork of soil between them, the trumpets rang out, the church bells pealed, and champion after champion rode down into the galleries to break a lance with the enemy by the light of lamps or torches¹². Even King Henry, the duke of Burgundy, and the English dukes performed subterranean feats of arms against Barbazan and other leaders of the garrison¹³. Nevertheless, the siege began to drag. Although the army was said to be the

¹ D.K.R. xlv. 320; Juv. 558; Monstr. iii. 410; Waurin, ii. 326 (310); Le Fèvre, ii. 15; Chast. i. 154; Bourgeois, 144; Fenin, 135. Cf. Orig. Lett. iii. i. 67 sqq.

² Vita, 280.

³ Devon, 362, 363; Cal. Doc. Scot. iv. 181; Gesta, 143.

⁴ Monstr. iii. 410; Waurin, ii. 344 (325); Le Fèvre, ii. 21; Vita, 275; Norm. Chron. (Hellot) 61; Chast. i. 154.

⁵ Fenin, 142; Trahisons, 158.

⁶ Chast. i. 158.

⁷ Monstr. iii. 412; Fenin, 144; Chast. i. 160; Vita, 285.

⁸ Monstr. iii. 412 sq. For £8. 13s. 4d. paid for harps for the king and queen, see Devon, 363, Oct. 2, 1420.

⁹ Monstr. iii. 413.

¹⁰ Ibid. 410; Fenin, 144; Chast. i. 154; Vita, 279.

¹¹ Chast. i. 155.

¹² Vita, 279, 285, 286; Juv. 559 sq.; Waurin, ii. 328 (311); Fenin, 144; Chast. i. 157.

¹³ Vita, 286. [Mr Kingsford's recovery of the "First English Life of Henry V" has rehabilitated the famous story which tells how Henry and Barbazan, each being unknown to the other, fought for a long time in a mine, and how Barbazan, on learning the name of his adversary, ordered the barriers in the mine to be closed and refused to fight further (First Life, 168 sq.; Holinshed, ed. 1807-8, iii. 122).]

largest with which Henry ever conducted a siege¹, yet week after week passed in leisurely blockade. Quite early in the siege² the unfortunate Charles was brought over in order to appeal to the loyalty of the garrison; but in reply to his demand for admittance, the besieged declared that though they would gladly receive him as their French liege lord, no English king should ever have their obedience—an answer which greatly nettled Henry, who sent word that the time was coming when they would have to obey an English king whether they wished or no³. It was much worse, however, that disaffection should appear in the Burgundian camp. Many now scrupled to accept the English king as the real ruler of France, though they had sworn to the treaty of Troyes because at the moment no other course seemed open⁴. At one time it even seemed as though the alliance was in danger⁵, and it became hard to keep the Burgundian captains at their posts. The count of Conversen departed for his castle of Brienne beyond Troyes, though he was captured by the Armagnacs on the way⁶; and when sickness was raging in the camp, the prince of Orange, with many other leaders, departed abruptly, and neither Henry nor the duke of Burgundy was able to prevent them⁷. Even before the siege, too, disturbances had occurred between the English and the quarrelsome Picards, and it was necessary to keep the two contingents apart⁸. Disease of course was causing heavy casualties, as it always did in long mediaeval sieges. Nevertheless time was on the whole on the side of the besiegers, and the duke of Burgundy himself remained staunch. It was with his consent that Henry, alarmed at symptoms of disaffection among the Parisians, placed English garrisons in the Bastille, the Louvre, the Hôtel de Nesle, and the castle of Bois de Vincennes, Clarence being appointed captain of Paris in place of the count of St Pol⁹. And in order to repair the losses suffered

¹ [There is not enough extant evidence for even an approximate estimate of its size; but numerous captains, both French and English, were present (Coll. of Arms, MS. M 9, ff. 40 sqq.; Halle, 102), and while we are told nothing about the strength of their several retinues, it is plain that the force must have been very formidable.]

² e.g. on July 18 and 23 (Ordonnances, xi. 95). Cf. Chast. i. 159; Monstr. iii. 412.

³ Chast. i. 158.

⁴ Fenin, 137.

⁵ Vita, 282.

⁶ Monstr. iii. 413; Waurin, ii. 330 (313).

⁷ Chast. i. 180; Monstr. iv. 10; Waurin, ii. 339; Le Fèvre, ii. 18; Juv. 560; Vita, 282. The English afterwards accused the duke of cowardice (ibid. 281).

⁸ Fenin, 139.

⁹ Monstr. iv. 1 sq. The Bastille was in the hands of the English by Sept. 7 (D.K.R. xlii. 390 sq.). If the author of the Vita is to be believed, they seized it by means of a trick carefully planned by Henry, who expected resistance on the part of the Burgundian garrison (Vita, 282).

by the besiegers of Melun, Duke Philip ordered John of Luxemburg, who was at his castle of Beaufort, to bring up what forces he could from Picardy. John collected a force at Péronne, hurried with them across the Oise at Pont St Maxence, and pushed on with all speed towards Melun. When on Oct. 18 the besieged saw them approach in battle order across the high ground to the north, they took them for the long-expected relieving force. The bells rang, the walls were manned, and the English and Burgundians were derisively exhorted to saddle up, as they would soon be shifted. But as the new-comers drew near, the defenders saw the truth, and with drooping heads they left the ramparts¹. This disappointment must have had a grave moral effect, especially as the town was beginning to suffer terribly from famine. Bread gave out about this time², and for the next month the people in the town ate horses, dogs, cats, rats, mice, and anything, however repulsive, that could be used for food³. Even now, however, Henry never risked an assault on the breaches that were made⁴. Appeals to the dauphin for aid⁵ brought a final answer that he lacked sufficient men to attempt the relief of the town, with the advice that the defenders had better make what terms they could. So at length hunger and pestilence prevailed; the inevitable parley began; on Nov. 17 Walter Hungerford, with two notable Burgundians, Jean de Roubaix, lord of Herzelles, and Jean de Courcelles, was commissioned to conclude final terms⁶; and the actual surrender took place next day⁷. All those in the town, whether members of the garrison or civilians, were to leave their arms undamaged in the castle, and were to be held as prisoners till their ransoms had been paid; their lives were to be spared, but before their release they would have to give security that they would never serve again under the enemies of the French king. Two groups, however, were excepted from these terms; Englishmen or Scotsmen who had taken part in the defence were to be at Henry's mercy, and those who were in any way implicated in the murder at Montereau were to be put to trial⁸. The occasion, too, served to illustrate Henry's stern zeal for discipline. A favourite captain of his, Bertrand de Chaumont, who had lands in Guienne and had fought on the English side at Agincourt, was charged

¹ Chast. i. 181; Monstr. iv. 10 sq.; Waurin, ii. 340 (321).

³ Fenin, 145; Waurin, ii. 340; Monstr. iv. 11; Chast. i. 177.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 11 sq.; Le Fèvre, ii. 19.

⁶ Rym. x. 29 sq.

² Juv. 560.

⁴ Juv. 558.

⁷ Ibid. 30.

⁸ The terms of surrender are given in Monstr. iv. 12 sq.

with having been bribed to connive at the escape of some of the suspects. When Henry heard the report he was much disturbed, and said that he would rather have given 50,000 nobles than that such disloyalty should have occurred. The duke of Burgundy pleaded and the duke of Clarence went down on his knees in behalf of the culprit; but Henry only answered, "By St George, fair brother, had it been yourself we should have done the same." He gave the offender time for shrift and then had his head struck off, saying that he would have no traitors about him if he knew it¹.

In strict accordance with the terms of the capitulation 500 or 600 emaciated prisoners, including many citizens of the town, were sent under escort in boat-loads to Paris, where they were incarcerated in the Palais, the Châtelet, the Temple, the Bastille, the Hôtel de Nesle and other places, where many who could not find a ransom died². Early in 1421 those who were accused of being concerned in the murder of John the Fearless were tried by the *Parlement*, and three were hanged³. Barbazan was at first imprisoned in Paris⁴, but was afterwards removed to Château Gaillard, where he remained till the French recaptured the castle in 1430⁵. He was accused of complicity in the crime of Montereau, but was acquitted⁶. The conditions of the surrender, as reported by Burgundian chroniclers⁷, fully justify Henry's action; but they were misunderstood, wilfully or not, by writers on the other side, who accuse Henry of a breach of faith such as would have disgraced the veriest tyrant⁸. One may well regret that the terms were not more generous, but they savour more of Philip's lust for vengeance than of Henry's soldierly magnanimity, which had constrained him during the siege to express his admiration for the courage of the garrison⁹. While, however, the usual charges against Henry in this connection are beside the mark, he may in one respect be justly blamed in the bitterest terms. Among the defenders of Melun were twenty

¹ Monstr. iv. 14 sq.; Le Fèvre, ii. 24; Waurin, ii. 343 (324); Fenin, 146; Chast. i. 184, 185; Juv. 561.

² St Denys, vi. 448; Juv. 561.

³ Fauquembergue, ii. 3, 12, 13, 14, 16; Félibien, iv. 585.

⁴ Norm. Chron. (Williams) 203, (Hellot) 62. ⁵ Fenin, 145; La Barre, i. 305.

⁶ For his trial in 1424 on the charge of being concerned in the murder of Duke John, see Colbert MS. 9681, 5, fol. 125, quoted in Raoulet, 169. [The story in the "First Life," given on the authority of the earl of Ormonde, is that Henry would have had Barbazan executed, but that he appealed "to the Judgement of the officers of armes," on the ground that, having fought in single combat, he and the king were brothers-in-arms and therefore the one might not put the other to death—a contention upheld by the heralds (p. 170).]

⁷ Monstr. iv. 12 sqq.; Chast. i. 178. The latter says that the terms would have been harder if the real straits of the defenders had been known.

⁸ Juv. 564; J. Chartier (Vallet de Viriville), iii. 247.

⁹ Juv. 560.

Scottish mercenaries with their captain. No suspicion of being implicated in the Montereau tragedy could possibly attach to them; but just as the dummy king of France had been brought forward to put Frenchmen in the wrong, so the captive king of Scotland was used to work the ruin of the Scots. On his arrival King James had summoned them to surrender on their allegiance. They refused; and when the siege was over, Henry had them all hanged for disobedience to their king¹.

[Apart from the sieges of Sens, Montereau, and Melun, the English had done little fighting in 1420. Early in the year they had begun an offensive in Maine, under the direction of the earl of Salisbury. Beaumont-le-Vicomte was soon recovered². Ballon fell on Feb. 28. On March 3 the castle and town of Montfort-le-Rotrou were taken and burned³. On the same day a force of French and Scots, which had left Le Mans with the object of relieving Fresnay-le-Vicomte, was ambushed by an English detachment under the earl of Huntingdon, and cut to pieces, the marshal de Rieux and the war-chest of the Scots being captured⁴. Fresnay fell soon afterwards⁵. On the other hand, the dauphinist garrison of Dreux, raiding northward, took Croisy on the Eure, liberating Ambroise de Loré, who was imprisoned in the castle⁶. Loré's release perhaps explains the check which the English soon afterwards suffered in Maine, where on May 10 the garrison of Le Mans killed sixty-three and took fifty-eight prisoners⁷. After this the military situation in Maine seems to have changed but little till the following year.]

Meanwhile civil strife had broken out in Brittany. After the murder at Montereau, the duke of Brittany had hesitated for a while, but in December, 1419, he signed a treaty which

¹ Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1217; Waurin, ii. 342. James seems to have lent himself to these proceedings willingly (Kluge, 52). A few of the defenders may have been treated in a way contrary to the terms of the surrender. Two monks were executed. One writer supposes that this was because they were apostates or guilty of irregular conduct (Chast. i. 184). Another, however, says that they had shown great zeal in the defence of the town, one having shot at least sixty Englishmen (Norm. Chron. [Hellot] 62).

² Triger, Beaumont, 31, n. 3.

³ Charles, Invasion, 24, n. 3.

⁴ F. Michel, i. 118, n. 1, citing Bodl. MS., Digby, 201, f. 281 r^o; Rym. ix. 885; Wals. ii. 331; Vita, 244 sq.; cf. Juv. 546.

⁵ Charles (Invasion, 24) gives the date as April 9, Triger (*Une forteresse du Maine*, 87) as April 19; but a pardon recorded in the Norman rolls (8 Hen. V, pt. 3, m. 28) shows that Fresnay was in English hands before Easter Sunday, April 7.

⁶ Bourgeois, 137; Juv. 556. It was probably at this time that an abortive attack was made on Mantes (Grave, Archives, 17 sq.).

⁷ Charles, Invasion, 25, n. 1. The affair is probably to be identified with the fight on the Sarthe noticed by Jean Juvénal (p. 546).

definitely ranged him on the side of Burgundy¹. Thereupon the dauphin's advisers entered into an intrigue with Olivier de Blois, count of Penthièvre, head of the family which had long disputed with the ruling Montforts the right to the ducal title². The outcome was that on Feb. 13, 1420, the duke and his brother Richard were treacherously kidnapped by the count, who, after inflicting many indignities upon them, placed them in close confinement at his castle of Champtoceaux³. It is likely that if the Bretons had shown general approval of the stroke, the duke and his brother would soon have died. It was not long, however, before the futility of the plot became manifest. The duke's Council took vigorous action, proclaiming the *ban* and *arrière-ban*⁴. The duchess made a spirited appeal to the Breton Estates, who were fully sympathetic with her⁵; and embassies were sent to King Henry, asking for the release on parole of the duke's brother Arthur of Richemont⁶, and to the dauphin, begging him to use his good offices on behalf of the duke himself⁷. Henry's reply was friendly but vague⁸: the dauphin temporised, but privately exhorted the count to keep a firm hold of his captive⁹. Meanwhile, however, the troops of the Montfort party were vigorously reducing such strongholds as adhered to Olivier de Blois¹⁰, and before long the duke and his brother were removed from Champtoceaux and taken from place to place in Poitou, the Limousin, and Saintonge¹¹. But Champtoceaux was vigorously besieged, and in the hope of securing lenient terms for himself, the count, about the beginning of July, brought the duke back to Brittany and liberated him, though he did not thereby avert condemnation of himself as a traitor or the confiscation of his property¹².

The duke's release removed the principal reason for permitting his brother Arthur to return to France. Negotiations

¹ Blanchard, no. 1381; Beaucourt, i. 202.

² Cosneau, Connétable, 53.

³ Cagny, 117; Luce, Mont-St-Michel, i. 22; Morice, Preuves, ii. 1000 sq., 1070 sqq.; Blanchard, no. 1456.

⁴ Morice, Preuves, ii. 948, 1000; Blanchard, no. 1475.

⁵ Morice, Hist. i. 475, Preuves, ii. 1001; Trévédý, 23; Cosneau, Connétable, 54.

⁶ The envoys were the bishop of Nantes, the lord of Montauban, Henry du Juch, and Raoul le Sage (Morice, Hist. i. 472, Preuves, ii. 1037 sq.; Devon, 362; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 277, 279; Rym. ix. 876; Gruel, 20 sq.). ⁷ Rym. x. 2.

⁸ Ibid. ix. 876; Morice, Hist. i. 478, Preuves, ii. 1016; Trévédý, 24.

⁹ Rym. x. 2; Cosneau, Connétable, 494.

¹⁰ Blanchard, iii. nos. 1422, 1442, 1449; Morice, Preuves, ii. 1003; Bossard, 20.

¹¹ Blanchard, Introd. p. cxxv, no. 1449; Morice, Hist. i. 477; Bossard, 19; Rym. x. 2; Monstr. iv. 31.

¹² Morice, Hist. i. 478, 479; Blanchard, nos. 1449, 1456; Gruel, 21; Cosneau, Connétable, 57; Trévédý, 24.

on the matter had, however, gone some way¹; and Henry allowed them to proceed, perhaps thinking that Arthur's presence might be useful in case the duke should waver in his loyalty to the Burgundian cause². When he gave his word to Henry not to escape and promised to go back to England at Michaelmas, 1422, if his ransom had not been paid³, he was escorted across the Channel and taken to the king, who was then before Melun, where he arrived on Oct. 28, 1420⁴.

With Brittany in confusion, there was little danger to Normandy from the west. In January, 1420, the English seem to have expected a raid⁵, but nothing came of it, probably because of the kidnapping of the duke. For their part, the English were closing in on Mont-St-Michel, constructing a fort at Ardevon and placing a garrison on the rock of Tombelaine⁶. The abbot had already had dealings with the English⁷, and he was now replaced as captain of the Mount by the count of Aumale, who took over the command on May 1⁸. He soon, however, went away, taking with him many valuables, which the English believed him to have divided among his men, regardless of the claims of the dauphin. On June 15 John Ashton, *bailli* of the Cotentin, reported to Henry that the garrison of Mont-St-Michel numbered no more than one hundred men, that their water-cistern was broken, and that the place might speedily be reduced. The frontier, he said, was quiet, and he hinted that a raid on Anjou might be made with every prospect of success, for the inhabitants of the country were alienated from the dauphin by the depredations of his troops and the Scots⁹. Henry, however, encouraged no such pretentious enterprises, and the frontier of Lower Normandy remained astonishingly peaceful for the rest of the year¹⁰.

¹ Rym. ix. 884, x. 2, 9 sq.; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 275; Exch. Accts. 49/17; Morice, Hist. i. 478.

² The duke showed no eagerness to accept the treaty of Troyes, though he was invited to do so by Henry (Rym. ix. 15 sq.), and he was soon in negotiation with the earl of Buchan, who visited him in October (Blanchard, nos. 1433, 1464).

³ Rym. x. 12; Gruel, 20 sqq., 27.

⁴ Morice, Hist. i. 481; Cosneau, Connétable, 58; Devon, 367; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 278. There are many interesting details of the journey in For. Accts. 54, C.

⁵ [Newhall, 270, n. 6.]

⁶ Ibid. nn. 7, 8.

⁷ D.K.R. xli. 775; cf. Luce, Mont-St-Michel, i. 94 n.

⁸ Ibid. 22.

⁹ Orig. Letters, II. i. 72 sqq. Ashton's report is also printed by Bréquigny, 254. Ellis ascribes it incorrectly to 1419, Bréquigny to 1421. The internal evidence is decisively in favour of 1420.

¹⁰ Pontorson seems not to have been recovered by the English on May 31, 1420 (Luce, i. 100, where there is no mention of it in the list of Suffolk's dignities, though he was titular captain of the place), but it was probably taken before the end of the year (For. Accts. 61, B^{vo}).

CHAPTER LXV

THREE YEARS IN ENGLAND

AFTER the capture of Oldcastle the domestic history of England was very uneventful for nearly two years. Bedford remained warden or lieutenant till the end of 1419, when he was succeeded by his brother Humphrey¹. No parliament was summoned till the autumn of 1419, when the lords and commons assembled at Westminster on Oct. 16². No new temporal lords were summoned, and of those who had received writs for the previous parliament, Gilbert Talbot was dead. Of the lords spiritual Archbishop Chichele, who was abroad with the king, received no summons. Thirty-seven counties and seventy-nine boroughs returned representatives, none of whom call for special notice³. Among the judges William Babington appears for the first time⁴.

When the members assembled, five weeks had elapsed since the murder of John the Fearless; but the full significance of that event was not yet manifest, and the chief fact before the estates was that the failure of the Meulan conference had forced Henry to go on with the war. The chancellor accordingly addressed them on the text, "Let us not be weary in well-doing⁵." The king had been doing well; his enemies were keeping his inheritance from him, but he wanted peace and had gone in person to secure it; nevertheless he had failed; money was wanted to safeguard the sea, to defend Calais, and to carry on the war; unless it was forthcoming the war would have to be stopped, which God forbid⁶! Next day Roger Flower was chosen Speaker for the third time. Parliament continued till Nov. 13⁷, when it voted a tenth and a fifteenth

¹ Humphrey was appointed on Dec. 30, 1419 (Rym. ix. 830, 831).

² Rot. Parl. iv. 116.

³ Return Parl. i. 291 sqq., App. p. xxi.

⁴ Babington, who came from East Bridgeford, Notts., had been made king's attorney in 1414 and a serjeant-at-law in 1418 (Rot. Parl. iv. 107). He was appointed Chief Baron of the Exchequer on Nov. 4, 1419, and became a Justice of the Common Pleas on June 30, 1420 (Foss, iv. 284; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 295; Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 70). He died in 1455 (Cal. Inq. post mort. iv. 263, 298).

⁵ Gal. vi. 9.

⁶ Rot. Parl. iv. 116.

⁷ Ibid. 117.

to be paid at Candlemas next and a further third of a tenth and fifteenth payable at the succeeding Martinmas. The king, it had been announced, was specially anxious to know how the country had been faring and what amendments (if any) were needed in the laws. But parliament made little use of the opportunity thus offered. It was resolved that, as large quantities of English coins were passing out of the country and the supply for ordinary purposes was running short, there should be a fresh issue of coinage; that when the money voted in taxes should come in, it should be spent in England on corn, cloth, and other necessaries for the army in France; and that as many sacks of wool as the king should desire should also be bought in the country and shipped direct to Normandy¹ instead of being sent through Calais, as required by the Statute of the Staple. Otherwise, parliament's main achievement was to confirm a statute of 1389 limiting the right to keep sporting dogs to landowners and well-to-do clergymen².

The southern convocation met on Oct. 30³. Like parliament, its chief business was the grant of money. But the clergy, like everybody else, were beginning to be tired of the war⁴, and it took much debate for them to make up their minds, for in many cases the contributions due for the envoys to Constance were still unpaid. On Nov. 20, however, they agreed to a tax of a twentieth on benefices and 6s. 8d. from chantry chaplains⁵. They then adjourned. The northern convocation met at York from Jan. 13-18, 1420⁶. Those present pleaded that there was great poverty in the north of England owing to drought, murrain, and invasion, but they also ultimately granted a twentieth of their incomes, from whatever ecclesiastical source, to be payable on May 1⁷.

About this time there were numerous rumours of attempts on the king's life by witchcraft. During a recent visit to

¹ Rot. Parl. iv. 118.

² Ibid. 122.

³ Conc. iii. 393.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Ibid. iii. 395; Wake, 354; D.K.R. ii., App. II. 189.

⁶ Conc. iii. 396.

⁷ Rym. ix. 855. The chapter of York was to be excused payment of half the amount due from them, in order that they might not be hindered in rebuilding the choir of the minster. Several religious houses claimed a similar remission, among them being Meaux, which was as usual suffering from floods, and Selby, which was weighed down by debt and was actually raided by robbers while Convocation was sitting. Many other houses, such as Drax, Mattersey, Felley, Rufford, Watton, Ellerton, Eggleston, and Kirkham, and every church in Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland pleaded total inability to pay.

England, Archbishop Chichele had issued a circular to the bishops, dated Sept. 25, 1419, stating that the king had ordered that prayers should be offered for his protection against necromancers, and he accordingly announced forty days' remission of penance to all who should attend the masses and bi-weekly processions instituted when the king went abroad in 1417, seeing that these solemnities had lost their novelty. The bishops were to publish the announcement before All Saints' Day¹. At the meeting of convocation in the same autumn, the archbishop announced that the reform of abuses among the clergy must be considered²; but attention seems to have been diverted from this subject to the dangers arising from the black art and Lollardy. On Nov. 9 the assembly had before it a chaplain named Richard Walker, who had been charged with practising witchcraft in the diocese of Worcester and convicted at a visitation held by the prior in Worcester cathedral. In proof of the charges there were produced two books containing written spells and pictures savouring of magic³, a box containing a beryl cunningly suspended in black leather⁴, three little schedules and two little figures in yellow wax. Walker pleaded guilty and declared himself willing to recant; and an impressive penance was arranged for him. On Nov. 16, at Paul's Cross in presence of the archbishop, several bishops, and a large crowd, the bishop of Llandaff⁵ preached a sermon at Walker, who stood there with the books, the box, and the wax images. When the bishop had finished, the penitent declared his magic to be false and accursed in deed and word. Then the books were fastened round his neck, one in front and one behind, with the pages open for everyone to see the bad pictures, and he was marched bare-headed all down the Cheap and back to the south side of the churchyard, where the books and other exhibits were burned. After this Walker was allowed to go.

The heresy hunt was not yet over. On Nov. 20, three more chaplains came up for judgment—Ralph Outrede, William Brown, and Richard Wyche⁶. All had been in prison for some years charged with heresy, and they were now called upon publicly to recant. After canonical punishment had been fully

¹ Conc. iii. 392.

² *Ibid.* 393.

³ "Artem magicam sapientes."

⁴ "Lapis de berillo artificialiter in corio nigro suspensus."

⁵ John Zouche, 1408-1422 (*Stubbs, Reg.* 89, 239).

⁶ Conc. iii. 394 sq.

explained to them, so that they might know what to expect in the event of relapse, Outrede and Brown were set free on giving security for their good behaviour in future. Wyche, however, whose touching story remains in his own words, was reminded of his trial at Bishop Auckland eighteen years before¹. After long imprisonment in the north he had recanted and been sent to the Chancery at Westminster, where he was required to give the customary caution and then set free. He was, however, re-arrested with William Brown when the king sailed for France in 1417², and imprisoned in the Fleet, where he had since remained. His case was now reserved for further consideration. How long he continued in prison we do not know; but he certainly made a full submission and secured his release, only to fall again into heresy and to perish at the stake in 1440³.

But the most notable figure affected by this outbreak of religious panic was the king's stepmother Queen Joan, from whom he had parted on perfectly friendly terms. Though she had been resident in England for over sixteen years, neither she nor her children seem ever to have been popular with the English people, and as English traders were continually suffering from the attacks of the Breton pirates, she and the members of her household were exposed to periodical outbursts of national resentment. Such a time was the present, and the first result was that all foreigners about her were expelled from England on the ground that they were carrying treasure out of the country and giving information to the enemy⁴. On Sept. 27, 1419, an order was issued that all her dowry and other belongings should be taken into the hand of the Treasurer of England, except a portion for the reasonable expenses of her maintenance⁵; and on Oct. 1 she was put under arrest and detained in the manor-house of Rotherhithe until her case should be further considered⁶. The suddenness of the event has given rise to various speculations as to its cause. Some have supposed⁷ that it was due to a desire for additional security for the good behaviour of Joan's son, the duke of Brittany; but there seems to have been little friendliness at the time between

¹ Cf. Wylie, iii. 463.

² Devon, 352.

³ Greg., Chron. 183; Three Fifteenth Cent. Chrons. 63. In 1434 he became rector of Leaveland, near Faversham (Cal. Pat. Hen. VI, ii. 342), which he exchanged in 1436 for the vicarage of Harmondsworth, near West Drayton in Middlesex (*ibid.* iii. 32, 426; Stow, Annals, 378).

⁴ Rot. Parl. iv. 306.

⁵ *Ibid.* 118.

⁶ Brut, ii. 444.

⁷ Trébuchet, 96.

the two. On the whole the most convincing explanation is the contemporary one, that she was believed to have practised magic against the king. Implicated in the same charge were her confessor, John Randolf, a Franciscan friar from Shrewsbury¹, Roger Colles, another Shrewsbury man, and Pernel Brocart, both members of her household². Randolf was captured in Guernsey³, taken to Normandy and imprisoned in Château Gaillard, and afterwards sent back to England and lodged in the Tower⁴. As for Queen Joan herself, we have evidence that some of her possessions were seized by the sheriffs in whose counties they lay⁵, and that others were farmed by various persons soon after her arrest⁶. The royal Council appointed Thomas Lilbourne to act as clerk of her household and his account for the first ten weeks of her captivity is extant⁷. During most of this time she was at the king's manor of Rotherhithe. It was intended that she should spend Christmas at Leeds, and with this intention she journeyed thither, arriving on Dec. 7. She stayed there only three days, however, and then returned to Rotherhithe. On Dec. 15 she was handed over to the custody of John Pelham⁸, who acted as her governor till Mar. 8, 1420, during which time she was no doubt at Pevensey⁹. In addition to the confiscation of her lands she had to submit to the removal of all the members of her household¹⁰. But a sufficient number of attendants were selected to replace them, and the king's Portuguese physician, Pedro de Alcobaça, was appointed to attend on her, the rare and costly medicines he prescribed being all bought for her. In fact, Lilbourne's account shows that Joan must have lived in great comfort during her detention.

¹ Cotton, Abridg. 557; Brut, ii. 422 sq., 444, 491; Rot. Parl. iv. 118; Devon, 365.

² Rot. Parl. iv. 118. ³ Brut, ii. 422.

⁴ Devon, 365; Brut, ii. 423.

⁵ e.g. Rec. Roll 7 Hen. V, Mich., Jan. 18, 1420 (Wilts.); Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 18, 1421 (Hereford); Rec. Roll 8 Hen. V, Pasch., July 7, 1420 (Cornwall); *ibid.* June 25, 1420 (Devon); *ibid.* Mich., Feb. 17, 1421 (Essex).

⁶ e.g. Rec. Roll 7 Hen. V, Mich., Jan. 19, 1420.

⁷ Exch. Accts. 406/30.

⁸ *Ibid.*; Wals. ii. 331.

⁹ *Ibid.*; Stow, Chron. 358.

¹⁰ Wals. ii. 331; Stow, Chron. 358.

[*At this point Dr Wylie's contribution to the text ceases.*—W. T. W.]

[For the form and content of Chapters LXVI–LXXV
I am solely responsible.—W. T. W.]

CHAPTER LXVI

HENRY IN PARIS

WHEN Melun had fallen, Henry and Duke Philip granted leave to many of their troops, who had been severely tried during the siege. They then joined Charles VI at Corbeil, whence the three, at the head of a large force, went to Paris. Henry, there can be little doubt, had been to Paris before, but this was to be his formal entry into his prospective capital, and the Parisians prepared an imposing welcome. On Dec. 1 the magistrates and the leading burgesses (all clad in red), the *Parlement*, the University, and almost the whole body of clergy were to meet the august visitors outside the city, though the chapter of Notre Dame, whose relations with Henry were strained, refused to go farther than the Hôtel Dieu, which almost adjoined the cathedral. The streets along which the procession was to pass were as bravely decorated as the poverty of the citizens permitted. Unfortunately the kings arrived earlier than was expected and before those who were to greet them outside the walls had set forth¹. Nevertheless, they made an impressive entry, welcomed by the enthusiastic crowds which lined the Rue St Denis². In front rode the two kings side by side in royal apparel, Henry, who was on Charles's left³, regarding the people with calm and impassive mien⁴. On the left side of the street rode the duke of Burgundy by himself; but while he thus emphasised his independence, he symbolised his loyalty by allowing the kings to keep a horse's length in advance of him⁵. He was followed by the knights and squires

¹ Monstr. iv. 15; Fenin, 149; Chast. i. 187 sq.; Fauquembergue, i. 389; Grassoreille, 124, n. 3, 125 n. 1.

² Bourgeois, 144; Monstr. iv. 16; Chast. i. 188; Juv. 561; Fauquembergue, loc. cit.

³ Monstr. iv. 16; Chast. i. 187; Cordeliers, 288.

⁴ "Moult se contenoit fierement et regardoit le peuple d'ung estrange œil," Chast. i. 187. Chastellain, it must be remembered, wrote long after the duke of Burgundy had abandoned the English alliance, and he persistently represents Henry as a haughty tyrant.

⁵ "Tenant son renc seul, et apres, chevaucha a senestre coste de la rue, un peu moins avant que les deux roys, environ le long de leurs chevaux," Chast. i. 187. Chastellain's testimony to Burgundy's place in the procession is very weighty, for it must have gone against his grain to put the duke in the second rank.

of his household, who carefully held themselves apart from the English and other Frenchmen. Most of them, like the duke, wore black. On the other side of the street, immediately behind the kings, rode the dukes of Clarence and Bedford, and then came a great array of English nobles and knights, conspicuous among them being the duke of Exeter and the earls of Warwick, Huntingdon, and Salisbury¹. At the cross-roads which the cavalcade passed, it was met by processions of clergy singing *Te Deum* and *Benedictus qui venit* and offering relics for the kings to kiss, this welcome deriving added solemnity from the fact that it was Advent Sunday. Each time that relics were presented to Charles he signed to Henry to kiss first, but Henry, raising his cap and bowing, motioned to Charles to precede him, a pantomime repeated several times as they made their way to Notre Dame, where they dismounted and prayed before the high altar². It was now nearly dark: Burgundy escorted Charles to the Hôtel St Pol, whence he himself went to his own Hôtel d'Artois; Henry and his brothers were lodged in the Louvre; and the rest of the English found quarters where they could, some of the soldiers being billeted in villages near Paris³.

Next day there arrived the two queens, accompanied by many noble ladies, mostly English⁴. They were met by Duke Philip, Henry's brothers and other English lords, and the notables of Paris. They entered by the Porte St Antoine, and were received by the populace with an enthusiasm little less than that shown the day before. Numerous gifts were offered to the kings and queens, especially to Henry and Catherine. All day and night fountains of wine and rose-water played in the streets, and the citizens of Paris, after their volatile fashion, abandoned themselves to rejoicing⁵. There is no reason to doubt that they were genuinely glad to welcome Henry as a saviour from disorder and famine⁶. It was only a later generation

¹ Monstr. iv. 15 sq.; Chast. i. 187 sq.; Cordeliers, 288 sq.

² Bourgeois, 144; Monstr. iv. 16; Chast. i. 187, 188; Grassoreille, 125, n. 1. In the Rue de la Calandre, between the Palace and the cathedral, on platforms one hundred paces long, was a "pageant" of the Passion, as represented on the walls of the choir of Notre Dame. It was a piteous spectacle, and all who saw it were touched to the heart (Bourgeois, 144).

³ Ibid.; Monstr. iv. 16.

⁴ Bourgeois, 145; Monstr. iv. 17; Juv. 561; Fauquembergue, i. 389 sq.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 17; Chast. i. 192 sq.; Bourgeois, 144 sq.; Grassoreille, 125, n. 1.

⁶ The kings were "moult joyusement et honnorablement receuz" (Fauquembergue, i. 389). The author of the "Journal d'un Bourgeois" (loc. cit.) is still more emphatic.

of Frenchmen that felt constrained to make excuses for their jubilation and to hint that they would have been no less joyful if the duke of Burgundy had come alone¹. But it cannot have been long before their optimism began to cool. No sooner had the royal visitors arrived than the price of bread, already very high, rose sharply; and a loaf weighing twenty ounces and consisting mainly of bran cost twenty-four *deniers paris*². Before Christmas bread doubled in price, and could not be had unless one went to the bakers' shops before daybreak and stood drinks to masters and men. The poor lived mainly on cabbages and turnips, for after standing long in a queue at a baker's women often had to go away with nothing. The dunghills of Paris were covered with children dying of hunger and cold³.

Meanwhile Henry was showing his customary activity. As long as his triumph was incomplete he could take no rest. The machinery of government was kept working as usual⁴. Immediately after the entry of the two kings, the count of St Pol was sent to Picardy and other parts of the north to receive from those under obligation to take it the oath to observe the treaty of Troyes⁵. The efficiency of the army was, as ever, one of the king's prime concerns, and on Dec. 5 he issued a number of commissions for holding musters of English troops, including reinforcements lately come from Wales⁶. He instituted an enquiry into the munitions of war then available in Paris and into the possibility of producing more⁷. At the same time Henry was, as usual, supplementing force by diplomacy; he was negotiating with the famous dauphinist leader Pierron de Luppé, captain of Montaigu⁸, while Hue de Lannoy was despatched at the head of an embassy to treat for an agreement with Castile⁹.

At this time, however, most of Henry's thoughts were claimed by the States-General, which, summoned some weeks previously, met on Dec. 6 in the lower hall of the Hôtel St Pol¹⁰.

¹ Chast. i. 188.

² Bourgeois, 145.

³ Ibid. 146.

⁴ The *Parlement*, for instance, held a well-attended session on Dec. 2, though it was a day of general festivity for the arrival of the queens (Fauquembergue, i. 388).

⁵ Cordeliers, 289.

⁶ D.K.R. xlii. 393.

⁷ Chast. i. 189 sq., n., 198 sq., n., where two long contemporary documents are printed by the editor, Kervyn de Lettenhove. They reveal Henry's interest in artillery and also the unshakable confidence of the French in the crossbow.

⁸ Rym. x. 33. The subject of discussion is not known.

⁹ D.K.R. xlii. 388.

¹⁰ Rym. x. 30; Juv. 561. The summons was originally for Nov. 12 and had evidently been sent at very short notice (G. Durand, *Inv. somm. des Arch. comm. d'Amiens*, ii. 34; Flammermont, 276).

There were of course no representatives of the dauphinist party or the regions under its control; but there is no reason to doubt that Charles VI and Henry intended the assembly to be a full meeting of the Three Estates¹. The French king was present at the opening session, when the chancellor, Jean le Clerc, speaking from the somewhat depressing text, "Audita est vox lamentationis et planctus Syon," expounded the causes of the summons². He recounted recent events, emphasised the necessity of confirming and executing the treaty of Troyes, and asked for the advice of his audience as to the best means of restoring public order, reforming the currency, and providing money for the war and other burdens on the state. Good laws, he added, were to be enacted by the government, and all concerned in the murder of the duke of Burgundy to be punished³. When the chancellor had read the treaty to the Estates, Charles declared that he had sworn to observe it, since it had been made for the good of the realm, and that all his subjects must do the like and promote its enforcement⁴. After further speeches addressed to the Estates, they were told to depart, discuss the matters which had been submitted to them, and return on the 10th with their answers. On the appointed day, in the presence of the two kings and their counsellors, a single spokesman declared on behalf of all the Estates that they approved of the treaty as beneficial to France and all Christendom and promised that they and their heirs would uphold it for ever. They begged that all Charles's subjects should be called upon to swear loyalty to it, that those who refused should be treated as rebels, and that it should be deemed part of the law of France⁵. Their spokesman, further, laid before the kings the principal evils from which France was suffering, and asked for remedies⁶. As for the coinage, they would accept whatever the king and his Council should ordain⁷. They offered suggestions as to the best ways of raising revenue, urging in particular that the burden of taxation should be equally distributed⁸.

¹ Ordonnances, xi. 122; Douët d'Arcq, i. 417; Rym. x. 30. The towns sometimes tried to avoid sending as many deputies as they were called upon to elect. Thus, Amiens sent four instead of eight (G. Durand, ii. 34), and Senlis three instead of four (Flammermont, loc. cit.). Abbeville elected only one deputy, but was almost certainly called upon for more (A. Ledieu, Inv. somm. des Arch. municip. d'Abbeville, p. 9).

² Juv. 561 sq.

³ Rym. x. 30 sq.; Ordonnances, xi. 109; Juv. 561 sq.; Vita, 290.

⁴ Rym. x. 31.

⁵ Ibid. 31, 110.

⁶ Vita, 291.

⁷ Juv. 562.

⁸ Ordonnances, xi. 110.

The outcome of these proceedings was the issue of several ordinances, of course in the name of Charles VI, though everyone knew that Henry was their real author¹. One of these enactments gave effect to the requests of the Estates respecting the treaty: while all Frenchmen were bound to take the oath to observe it, if required, it was always to be exacted from those entering upon ecclesiastical benefices or public office and those doing homage for their lands². The members of the States-General themselves took the oath, even those who had done so before³.

Another ordinance, dated Dec. 19, was designed to inform the public of the intentions of the authorities and to prepare their minds for the taxation to which the Estates had agreed. In all districts bordering on foreign or dauphinist territory, there was to be appointed a knight who, backed by an armed escort and assisted by the *bailli* and other local notables, would inspect all the fortresses of the region, garrison those belonging to the crown with troops who should be properly paid, and cause all others to be demolished unless they were of military value and the king or their owner was willing to provide garrisons for them. Small churches and monasteries were to be treated on the same principles. To carry out these measures, however, and to enable the king to accomplish his purpose of coining good money, the assistance of the people was necessary, for the revenue of the domain was insufficient to meet the expense and the new money would be so good that the crown would make nothing on it. So, for a year as from Feb. 1, in accordance with the advice of the Estates, the *quartage* on wine should be levied, as in former times, and the *gabelle* should be exacted throughout the kingdom. Moreover, a sales-tax of twelve *deniers* in the *livre* was to be levied on all merchandise save food. The money raised by these means was to be expended exclusively in the interests of the crown. It would be necessary, if the situation of public affairs was to be improved, to appoint numerous officials and employ a large force of well-paid troops, while it was essential that all Frenchmen should do their part in preventing the imminent ruin of the country. The taxes just authorised would not cover the cost of the proposed remedial measures, but Henry and the duke of Burgundy had promised to aid with all their resources of men and goods.

¹ Vita, 291.

² Rym. x. 31 sq., 110.

³ Fenin, 149.

The new taxes were to be farmed at auction whenever possible. It is strange that this ordinance, which was evidently meant to reconcile public opinion to the government's demands, was not proclaimed till Jan. 18, 1421¹.

On Dec. 19 orders were also given for the coinage of the new money. The royal mints were to strike gold crowns which should circulate at 22*s.* 6*d.* *tournois*, and silver coins worth respectively twenty, ten, and five *deniers*. Copper coins were to be made at the discretion of the masters of the mints. The standard of the new coins was to be extremely good. The price of the mark of gold was fixed at seventy-two *livres tournois*, that of the mark of silver at seven².

In order to provide the mints with the necessary bullion the Estates agreed to a general levy of silver. Everyone except the very poor was to be assessed, according to his wealth, at so many silver marks or fractions of a mark. Payment might be made in coin, plate, ornaments, or in any form convenient to the individual³. This exaction affected clergy as well as laity. The University of Paris, according to the dauphinist, Jean Juvé⁴nal, begged Henry for exemption, but being snubbed thought it well to hold their peace, since anyone who resisted or criticised the authorities was liable to be regarded as an Armagnac⁴. The chapter of Notre Dame had already decided to bear its share of the burden of taxation⁵.

The Estates were not suffered to depart until they had taken part in the formal proceedings which were now at length initiated against those involved in the murder of Montereau. Duke Philip, it is said, would have brought his case forward at Troyes, but that Charles had not been attended by a fitting number of councillors⁶. Henry, too, may have hoped that some of the dauphinist leaders might be led to surrender on the tacit understanding that nothing more was heard of their share in the crime. It was now evident, however, that Armagnac resistance would have to be broken down by force, and the solemn condemnation of their leaders for murder might perhaps

¹ Ordonnances, xi. 109-111.

² *Ibid.* 107 sq.

³ *Ibid.* 123; Douët d'Arcq, i. 414 sqq.

⁴ Jean Juvé⁴nal (p. 562) states that the government paid for the silver collected at the rate of 7 *l.* the mark; but there is no allusion to this in extant official records bearing on the matter, which include the accounts of two of the collectors in Paris (Douët d'Arcq, loc. cit.).

⁵ Grassoreille, 126, n. 1.

⁶ Chast. i. 194.

influence public opinion against them. Moreover, while the king was at Paris, accompanied by Henry and his brothers, with the *Parlement* at hand and the Estates assembled, the proceedings could be invested with all the gravity and dignity that their importance required.

The trial took place on Dec. 23¹ in the hall of the Hôtel St Pol. Charles VI sat on the judge's bench, with Henry beside him². Just below were Jean le Clerc, chancellor of France, Philippe de Morvilliers, First President of the *Parlement*, and other notable men of the king's Council. Near the middle of the hall sat Duke Philip, on the same bench as Henry's two brothers, but above them. He was clad in black, and accompanied by several bishops and others of his Council³. There were also in attendance a number of members of the States-General, which was deemed to be officially present⁴. The proceedings were opened by Nicolas Raolin, advocate in *Parlement* and *maître des requêtes* in the duke's household, who on behalf of the duke, his mother, and his sisters⁵, charged with the murder of Duke John the dauphin and several of his leading supporters, among them being the lord of Barbazan, Tanneguy du Chastel, Guillaume le Bouteiller, and Jean Louvet, president of Provence. He asked that these offenders might be carried in tumbrils, on three Saturdays or holidays, to all the cross-roads of Paris, where each, bare-headed and with a lighted candle in his hand, should confess with a loud voice that he and the others had basely murdered Duke John without provocation. Later they should repeat their confession on the scene of the crime, where they should be required to erect a collegiate church, the clergy of which should pray perpetually for the duke's soul. Similar churches should be built by the murderers at Paris, Dijon, Ghent, Rome, Santiago de Compostella, and Jerusalem⁶.

This was but the formal opening of the case. Raolin was followed by Pierre de Marigny, advocate of the king in *Parlement*, and Jean Aguenin, Charles's *procureur-général*, who urged that all the accused should be executed when caught, that meanwhile they should be outlawed and sentenced to total forfeiture of lands and goods, and that the dauphin should be

¹ Juv. 562.

² Monstr. iv. 17; Chast. i. 194.

³ Monstr. iv. 17 sq.; Chast. i. 195.

⁴ Rym. x. 34.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 18; Rym. x. 33; La Barre, ii. 194.

⁶ Monstr. iv. 18 sq.; cf. Tit. Liv. 90.

declared incapable of succeeding to the crown. Next came a speech by John Larcher, doctor of theology, who had been chosen by the University to support the plea of the duke. Spokesmen of the authorities and people of Paris and of the Estates were also heard¹. The chancellor replied that Charles, by the grace of God and with the advice of Henry, would do what justice required².

The same day letters-patent were drawn up announcing that having heard the demands for justice against those guilty of the murder, Charles had consulted his Council, and had closely examined the terms of the agreement concluded between Duke John and the dauphin in the summer of 1419. In view of this and of the sequel at Montereau, and on the advice of his "Grant Conseil," the presidents and lay members of the *Parlement*, and others of his counsellors, he now declared those guilty of the crime to have committed treason and to be incapable of holding or inheriting any dignities, honours, prerogatives, or property³. They had incurred, moreover, the penalties prescribed in the agreement of July, 1419, and their subjects and vassals were consequently freed from all obligations towards them. All this was without prejudice to charges which Burgundy had brought against certain individuals by name and to proceedings which might thereafter be initiated against others concerned in the crime. The king's councillors, the *Parlement*, and all his judges and officers, were ordered to render justice to the complainants and the king's *procureur*⁴. This document, stern though it sounds, was not of much practical consequence; it laid down how the guilty were to be punished, but expressed no opinion as to the guilt or innocence of those named by Burgundy's counsel⁵.

¹ It is not easy to make out the precise order of the proceedings. The account given is based on a comparison of the official statement (Rym. x. 34) with the relevant passages in Monstrelet (iv. 19), Jean Juvéal (562), and Tit. Liv. (90 sq.). Marigny, though apparently he appeared for the crown, was one of the duke's chamberlains (La Barre, ii. 180). Aguenin had been appointed Second President of the *Parlement* on Dec. 11, but presumably continued to act as *procureur-général* pending the appointment of a successor (Fauquembergue, i. 387, 389). Raolin and Larcher got fifty francs each from the duke for their speeches (La Barre, ii. 181, n. e).

² Monstr. iv. 19 sq.

³ "Inhabiles et Indignes de toutes Successions, directes et allaceaulx, et de toutes Dignitez (*sic*), et Honneurs, et Prerogatives quelconques."

⁴ It was doubtless this announcement which caused the dowager-duchess of Burgundy and her daughters, on Jan. 14 and 16, 1421, to appoint a number of *procureurs*, among them Raolin and Marigny, to act against the dauphin and others (La Barre, i. 344 sqq.).

⁵ Rym. x. 33-35.

All the notable visitors celebrated Christmas in Paris. The occasion seems to have cost Henry some of his popularity. For Charles and Isabel, at the Hôtel St Pol, were attended by only a few old servitors and other folk of humble estate, so that some of the leading citizens of Paris, who came to pay their respects, went away much grieved. Henry and Catherine, on the other hand, feasted in great magnificence at the Louvre, surrounded by English lords and ladies and visited by many Frenchmen, eager to parade their devotion¹. There is no reason to doubt the substantial truth of this celebrated description, though it is necessary to be on one's guard against the statements of historians like Chastellain, who wrote after the English had been expelled, and who gives accounts of their tyrannical and overbearing behaviour at this time which are supported by no contemporary evidence². It was soon believed that Henry had removed numerous officers appointed by Charles VI and by Dukes John and Philip, substituting for them creatures of his own³. We have not sufficient evidence to subject this assertion to a thorough test, but such appointments as are noted in contemporary authorities are all in favour of Frenchmen, except for two or three military commands⁴. No doubt the favoured Frenchmen could be trusted to uphold English interests; but it can no longer be believed that Henry seized the first opportunity to place the civil administration of France in the hands of Englishmen. Haughty and overbearing he may have been, but to the end he retained enough prudence to restrain him from the grosser forms of tyranny.

Nevertheless, Henry's relations with the Parisians were not comfortable. Even in England it was recognised that he was not loved in the French capital and that its populace must be kept in awe by a display of force⁵. Just at this time, too, Henry

¹ Monstr. iv. 22. Cf. Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 62 sq., which gives a less gloomy impression of the plight of the French king.

² Chast. i. 198 sqq.

³ Monstr. iv. 22 sq.; Fenin, 151. Fenin implies that Henry was particularly ruthless with officials appointed by Duke Philip.

⁴ e.g. on Dec. 26, 1420, Hugues le Coq was appointed *prévôt* of the merchants of Paris (Bourgeois, 147). A few days earlier, Jean du Mesnil had been sworn as *prévôt* of Paris (Bourgeois, 147; Fauquembergue, i. 390). Within three weeks of Christmas, five new *baillis* were appointed—for Melun, Vermandois, Amiens, Meaux, and Chartres. All were Frenchmen, or at least had French names (Fauq. i. 390, 391, ii. 21). New councillors retained to serve Charles VI on Jan. 9, 1421, were all French (*ibid.* 21 sq.). For the military appointments, see below, p. 381.

⁵ Wals. ii. 336.

experienced a rebuff from the chapter of Notre Dame. The bishop of Paris, Gerard de Montaigu, a firm Armagnac, who since 1418 had dwelt, exiled from his see, at Bois-Malesherbes, died in September, 1420. The few canons who had remained in residence shared the political views of their bishop, and the new ones nominated by the duke of Burgundy rarely came to Paris. On Montaigu's death the duke wished to secure the election of Philibert de Montjeu, a member of his Council, who had been provided to the bishopric of Amiens, though the resistance of the chapter had prevented him from gaining possession of that see. Agents of Charles VI, Henry, and the duke at once began to put pressure on the canons of Notre Dame, who sought to gain time by insisting that their absent fellows must be summoned to take part in the election. When, however, the bishops of Beauvais and Worcester renewed the attempt to coerce the chapter, they were plainly told that bishops ought not to be nominated by kings, that the canons intended to take St Ambrose as their example, and that the decrees of the Council of Constance must be obeyed and the election canonically conducted. It says much for Henry's fairness that he overrode the Burgundian officials who refused safe-conducts to the messengers sent to summon the absent canons, though it must be admitted that none of them was able to accomplish the purpose of their mission. It is asserted, on the other hand, that the chapter was privately warned that if it did not choose Philibert, Henry would make things unpleasant for the new bishop and his church. Whether this report was true or not, the canons refused to be moved, and on Dec. 27, twelve of them, with the succentor, elected Jean Courtecuisse, king's almoner, and a strong supporter of the conciliar movement—a man, so far as can be ascertained, very worthy of the honour¹.

Henry was beginning to feel the full weight of the burden he had imposed on himself. It was obviously undesirable for him to leave Paris at the moment; but affairs in Normandy demanded his attention, and he had already arranged a visit to England, where he had not been for three and a half years and where his subjects were clamouring for his presence². He evidently concluded that he might safely carry out his plans, and the event on the whole justified his forecast; for whatever

¹ Grassoreille, 111 sqq., 116 sqq., 126 sqq., 131; Bourgeois, 147 and n. 2, 164, n. 2.

² Vita, 293; Rot. Parl. iv. 123, 125.

disaffection might exist, it was not from the regions which accepted the treaty of Troyes, but from the dauphinists, that serious trouble arose in his absence. Clarence was left in command of the English troops and others of Henry's subjects in the territories of Charles VI¹, and Exeter was made military governor of Paris, with charge of the king's person². A few days after Henry's departure, the dauphin was solemnly summoned to the Marble Table. Of course he failed to appear. He was consequently pronounced contumacious, sentenced to banishment, and declared incapable of succeeding to the crown or his personal estates³. The judgment was pronounced by the royal Council and the *Parlement*, and even Chastellain admits that it was just⁴, though by that epithet he perhaps means what we should call "legal." Many of the Parisians were highly pleased, for they feared the dauphin greatly⁵.

Queen Catherine left Paris on Dec. 27, after a piteous leave-taking, especially from her father—at least so it was popularly believed⁶. If Henry did not accompany her he probably followed very shortly afterwards, for the two entered Rouen together on Tuesday, Dec. 31⁷. The duke of Burgundy, who was anxious to visit his own lands, remained in Paris only a few days longer, and on Jan. 10 left for Artois and Flanders⁸.

¹ Bréquigny, 253; Vita, 293.

² Fauquembergue, ii. 9; Monstr. iv. 35; Vita, 293.

³ Godefroy, Charles VI, Annotations, 703; Plancher, iv. p. clv; Monstr. iv. 36; Chast. i. 218 sq.; Fenin, 149; Tit. Liv. 91; Vita, 291. Attempts of modern writers to prove that no such sentence was ever passed are due to a perverse patriotism and do violence to the evidence. Even if the authenticity of the record quoted by Godefroy be challenged, the curious treatise printed by Plancher would be decisive.

⁴ "Juste définitive sentence," i. 218.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 37; Chast. i. 219.

⁷ Cochon, 285.

⁶ Bourgeois, 148.

⁸ Plancher, iv. 26; cf. *ibid.* p. xii. The chroniclers give the impression that Burgundy left Paris before Henry, but the documents cited by Plancher show that he must have stayed there some days longer (Monstr. iv. 23; Chast. i. 204; Fenin, 150; Cordeliers, 291; Tit. Liv. 91). According to Monstrelet the duke travelled *viâ* Beauvais, where he attended the celebrations occasioned by the entry into his see of the new bishop, Pierre Cauchon. He then made his way to Ghent, stopping at Amiens, Doullens, and Lille. He was at Arras on Jan. 16 (Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,043, no. 5582).

CHAPTER LXVII

NORMANDY, 1420-1422

HENRY's stay in Normandy lasted nearly three weeks. It was his first visit to the duchy since the treaty of Troyes had made provision for its future. It is true that the treaty evaded express approval of Henry's occupation of Normandy, and while by implication it accepted his sovereignty over it, there was a stipulation that on the death of Charles VI the duchy should be re-united to the French crown, the English supremacy over it being thus limited to a term of incalculable duration¹. Nevertheless, Henry now knew that for the present he was not to govern Normandy in the capacity of king of France, or as sovereign lord of a great tract of French territory definitively ceded to him. On the other hand, though he would have been within his rights in treating it as part of his English kingdom, he knew that he might not do so permanently. He could thus overhaul the machinery of government with a clearer idea of its future functions and burdens than he had hitherto possessed.

It must not be forgotten that the French territory over which Henry exercised sovereign power from May, 1420, to his death, comprised more than Normandy proper. It was officially described by various phrases—"Normandy and our conquest," "Our duchy of Normandy and other parts of France subject to us," or words to like effect². What was covered by such descriptions seems nowhere to have been authoritatively defined. Henry's right to sovereignty over regions outside

¹ Henry's sovereignty over Normandy may be inferred from clauses 14-18 of the treaty (Rym. ix. 799 sq.). It was stipulated in clause 18 that when Henry or his heir became king of France, "ducatus Normanniae, necnon omnia et singula Loca per ipsum in Regno Franciae conquista, erunt sub Ditioni, Obedientia, et Monarchia Coronae Franciae" (ibid. 900). Even after the treaty, Henry seems still to have based his claim to Normandy on the right of divinely-aided conquest: "Come, par la grace de Dieu, par nostre Conqueste, Nous soions Paisiblement en Possessions et vraies Saisines du Duchie de Normandie et de nostre Conquest. . ." (24 Jan. 1421, ibid. x. 56).

² See previous note. Cf. also "In Ducatu nostro Normanniae et aliis locis Conquestus nostri" (ibid. 106); "La duchie de normendie Et ailleurs du pays conquiz" (Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 1); "Normandie et autres pays de nostre conquest" (Bréquigny, 160); "Conquestus de Ducatu nostro Normanniae et aliis partibus nobis subjectis" (Rym. x. 142; cf. ibid. 103, 225); "Senescallum ducatus nostri Normannie et aliarum partium Francie nobis subjectarum" (Bréquigny, 159).

Normandy was even more vaguely dealt with in the treaty of Troyes than his claim to the duchy itself¹; later, indeed, Philip the Good denied that it had ever been admitted at all². Apparently Henry demanded absolute control over everything which he had won by the sword before the treaty was signed; but it seems never to have been explained whether he meant merely the territory of which the English were in effective occupation on May 21, 1420, or whether, besides this, he claimed areas which they had once overrun and afterwards lost. Further, while it was laid down in the treaty that Henry's subsequent conquests from the dauphinists should be restored to the obedience of the crown of France³, the town of Dreux, first captured by the English in August, 1421⁴, was placed under the captaincy of Gilbert Halsall, *bailli* of Évreux, and treated as part of Henry's "conquest⁵." Evidently the frontier of "Normandy and the Conquest" was both uncertain and variable. It is thus impossible to give more than a rough indication of it.

It was in the direction of the French capital that English jurisdiction had been carried farthest beyond the limits of Normandy proper. The English *bailli* of Mantes exercised authority over the *viguerie* of Mantes and the *prévôtés* of Meulan, Poissy, St Germain-en-Laye, and Montjoie, his sway extending to places within a dozen miles of the heart of Paris⁶. From St Germain the frontier of the *bailliage* ran west to the Eure, which it struck not far south of Anet⁷. North of the Seine, the *bailli* of Gisors had jurisdiction over Pontoise, Beaumont-sur-Oise, and Chaumont⁸. In other quarters, however,

¹ Clause 14 might be taken as accepting Henry's claim to Normandy, but other regions already conquered are not dealt with at all (Rym. ix. 899). Clause 17 admits that there are parts of France outside Normandy where his rule is *de facto* established. Clause 18 is too ambiguous to prove anything (*ibid.* 900).

² La Barre, i. 342.

³ Clause 14, Rym. ix. 899.

⁴ See below, p. 327.

⁵ D.K.R. xlii. 432, 437; For. Accts. 61, C; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5677. Dreux was nevertheless still regarded as belonging to the *bailliage* of Chartres (Martène and Durand, *Anec.* i. 1757 sq.). This is the more remarkable since in the middle of the fourteenth century Dreux had belonged to the *bailliage* of Mantes (Prentout, ii. 30).

⁶ C. Beaurepaire, États, 8; D.K.R. xlii. 397, 431, 448; Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 5 v^o, 17.

⁷ D.K.R. xlii. 435.

⁸ Rym. x. 160 sq.; Bréquigny, 184, 195; D.K.R. xlii. 397, 408. Nominally he had authority over the *bailliage* of Senlis (Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 17; D.K.R. xlii. 397, 408, 427) to which Chaumont properly belonged (Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, pt. 2, m. 6 d). But the city of Senlis was never actually captured by the English, and was always under a French *bailli* (Fauquembergue, ii. 27; cf. Flammermont, 229 sqq., 276).

English power was not firmly established for any great distance beyond the limits of the duchy. To the north of Gournay it reached hardly, if at all, beyond the eastern frontier¹. South of Alençon, it is true, English arms had on various occasions penetrated far into Maine, and at the beginning of 1421 Henry's authority extended some way south of Beaumont-le-Vicomte². But the English possessions in Maine were insecurely held, as events were soon to show.

Henry's main purpose in visiting Rouen was apparently to meet the Three Estates of Normandy and the other conquered territories, which of course had not been concerned in the recent doings of the States-General at Paris. It is not known how many representatives were summoned or attended, or how those present had been chosen. The proceedings began towards the middle of January and were very like those of the States-General. Henry urged the members of each Estate to observe the treaty of Troyes, pointed out the evils arising from the badness of the currency, and asked for advice on this topic and on the general welfare of the duchy. The Estates retired to deliberate. According to Henry, it was on their advice that, some days later, he ordained that all his subjects—especially ecclesiastics receiving preferment and office-holders on appointment to their posts—should swear loyalty to the treaty. He also announced a reform of the coinage, the necessary metal for which, it was agreed, should be obtained by a levy of silver from all save the very poor, at the rate of one mark for every one hundred *liv. tourn.* of income, the government promising to pay for every mark thus contributed seven *livres* of the new money within a month of its manufacture. The Estates, it seems, grumbled about the disturbed state of the country, and this gave Henry a good opening for requesting a grant of money. The clergy agreed to pay two tenths, and the towns consented to a *taille* sufficient to bring the total grant to 400,000 *liv. tourn.* Nobles, those bearing arms, and the destitute were to be exempt. The Estates admitted that the

¹ An entry in the Calendar of Norman Rolls (D.K.R. xlii. 448) gives the impression that in April, 1422, there were English garrisons in Picardy. The original text, however, refers only to "garrisones nostras in marchiis et versus marchias Picardie existentes" (Rot. Norm. 10 Hen. V, m. 25 d). In April, 1422, land at Tully in Vimeu was included in a grant made by Henry; but as other property concerned was undoubtedly beyond the limits of Henry's conquests, it cannot be inferred that Tully was under English rule (Bréquigny, 199).

² D.K.R. xlii. 387; Bréquigny, 156.

task of maintaining good government in Normandy and providing for its defence would require twice the amount voted, but pleaded their poverty in justification of not offering more. Henry at once made arrangements for collecting the money. The clerical grant was to be paid in two instalments, at dates to be announced later. The lay tax would be collected in three instalments, 100,000 *liv. tourn.* being due before March 1. The basis of the assessment was to be a charge of twenty *sous* on each hearth, "the strong aiding the weak." William Alington, the treasurer-general, was charged to take the necessary steps for carrying out these arrangements¹.

At this assembly the earl of Salisbury did formal homage for the county of Perche and Arthur of Richemont for the county of Ivry². There were also present in Rouen at this time envoys from Charles lord of Albret and the lord of St Bazeille and from the count of Foix³. The nature and outcome of their business may be more conveniently considered elsewhere. To Henry it must have seemed highly important; it certainly involved careful consideration of intricate details; and it is another instance of the king's untiring energy that he was able to attend to these complicated negotiations at a moment when he was not only confronting the Norman Estates but also making a careful enquiry into the administration of his territory.

The Norman Rolls abound with appointments of new officials made during this visit of Henry's. Few positions of high rank were affected, however, until near the end of his stay, when he had heard the advice and complaints of the Estates and knew what financial support they were prepared to give him. On Jan. 14, John Keighley was appointed to the *bailliage* of Rouen, *vice* Walter Beauchamp⁴; and on the 18th Richard Walkstede was made *bailli* of Caux, John Burgh *bailli* of Gisors, and William Tirwhit *bailli* of Mantes⁵. Their respective predecessors were Roger Fiennes⁶, Richard Woodville⁷, and Michel Guernier⁸. Fiennes and Guernier may perhaps have been removed for misconduct; but Beauchamp and Woodville were transferred to higher posts, the former becoming keeper

¹ Bréquigny, 160, 162, 163; Rym. x. 58, 85; Vita, 294; Wals. ii. 336.

² Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 64.

³ Rym. x. 42 sqq.

⁴ D.K.R. xlii. 388.

⁵ Ibid. 397.

⁶ Ibid. xli. 707, xlii. 374.

⁷ Ibid. xli. 806.

⁸ Ibid. xli. 769, 791; Bréquigny, 130.

of the wardrobe and treasurer of war¹, the latter seneschal of Normandy². This office had been held by Hugh Lutterell, who had been suffering from ill-health³. On the same day the duke of Clarence was given authority to call up not only all English subjects in France but also all inhabitants of the parts conquered by Henry and to employ them in military operations anywhere in Charles VI's or Henry's territories. In the commission bestowing these powers no title is given to Clarence; he was not, in fact, appointed to an office, but simply invested with the military authority of the king of England during the latter's absence⁴. Over the French in the territory where Henry was merely regent he still had no control whatever⁵.

None of these appointments, with the doubtful exception of Woodville's⁶, changed the system of government already established. Henry had decided—wisely, it would seem—to govern his conquered territory as a separate state, to try to make it pay for itself, and to make use of the existing political institutions. The arrangements which he sanctioned during his visit remained unaltered for the rest of his life, and may thus be conveniently surveyed at this point.

No attempt was made to introduce English institutions into the regions under Henry's sovereignty. The system of local government remained essentially as it had been before the

¹ Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 17, 1421, 9 Hen. V, Pasch., July 17, 1421, Mich., Oct. 20, 1421; For. Accts. 69, I.

² Bréquigny, 159 sq. The date of his appointment was Jan. 18, not 8 as in Newhall, 246.

³ Bréquigny, 103; Rot. Norm. 8 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 28 d; D.K.R. xlii. 379; Orig. Lett., Ser. II, i. 85 sq. From the summary of a document of Jan. 16, 1421 (D.K.R. xlii. 401), it would appear that on that date John Tiptoft was seneschal of Normandy. "Normandy," however, is evidently a slip for "Aquitaine," of which Tiptoft really was seneschal and where he was at the time (For. Accts. 56, F v^o; Rym. ix. 914, 915; Jurade, 438, 443, 455, 467, 505, 507; Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, File 667/933, 938; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 278, 319, 320, 324).

⁴ Rym. x. 49 sq. Clarence's position perplexed the chroniclers. The author of the *Vita* says that Henry appointed Clarence his lieutenant in the realm of France and elsewhere (292), an almost accurate description, for the title *locumtenens*, used in relation to the king, generally had a military significance (cf. below, pp. 245 sq.). Livius makes him "regent" of Normandy (91), and thus ascribes to him civil authority, for which there is no good evidence. In Brut, ii. 225, he is lieutenant of Normandy and the rest of the conquered territory, in Monstr. iv. 24, captain-general of Normandy—both descriptions understating his real powers.

⁵ This is evident from the terms of the commission, and also from the document giving the duke of Exeter authority over all Henry's subjects from overseas within the territory of Charles VI when Clarence was absent (Bréquigny, 253).

⁶ The authority bestowed on Woodville (Bréquigny, 159 sq.) was much wider than that granted to Lutterell in a writ of April 17, 1420 (Rot. Norm. 8 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 28 d). If Lutterell possessed further powers, the record of them seems to have been lost.

English invasion. There were eight *bailliages*—Cotentin, Caen, Alençon, Évreux, Rouen, Caux, Gisors, and Mantes¹. After Jan. 18, 1421, all the *baillis* were Englishmen². But the civil officers of lower rank, including the lieutenants of the *baillis*³, were almost all French. Of the *vicomtés* or *prévôtés*, upwards of thirty in number⁴, into which the *bailliages* were divided, none, to judge from the names in the records, was administered by an Englishman. And scarcely an English name appears in the numerous extant documents appointing receivers, sergeants, *guernetiers*, *procureurs*, money-changers, officers of the mints, surveyors of weights and measures, keepers of seals, to mention no others⁵. Few Normans, it is evident, would ever encounter an English civil official.

On the other hand, the military administration remained almost, if not quite, exclusively in English hands. It may be estimated that at the beginning of 1421 the troops serving in royal castles or the bodyguards of royal officials in the conquered territory numbered altogether about 4700 men. On or near the route connecting Cherbourg, Caen, and Évreux, there were approximately 950. On the southern frontier, between Avranches and Verneuil, there might be 1600. The protection of the Seine valley absorbed 1100; the eastern boundary, from Pontoise to Eu, 950 or thereabouts⁶. In

¹ Exch. Accts. 188/7; For. Accts. 61, F v^o; D.K.R. xlii., passim. Dieppe, which belonged to the archbishop of Rouen and enjoyed valuable privileges and immunities, had a so-called *bailli* of its own, who was evidently exempt from the authority of the *bailli* of Caux and dealt directly with the central government of the duchy (Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 77 d, 65; Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 2 v^o, 13; Bréquigny, 145, 168 sq., 184; D.K.R. xlii. 325, 356, 428, 433; Rym. x. 153, 195, 242). The so-called *bailli* of Eu was appointed as the king's agent in the *comté* of Eu while its lord, Henry Bouchier, was under age (Rym. x. 195 sq.; Bréquigny, 195; D.K.R. xlii. 423; G.E.C. i. 393; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5611; Yorkshire Archæological and Topographical Journal, ix. 401 sq., 410). He, however, was expressly subordinated to the *bailli* of Caux (Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 7).

² D.K.R. xli. 744, xlii. 354, 388, 397, 407; For. Accts. 61, C.

³ Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 30 sq.; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, nos. 5638, 5640, 5643, 5646.

⁴ The names and boundaries of the *vicomtés* and *prévôtés* seem to have varied somewhat in the last years of Henry's rule (cf. a mandate of Aug. 10, 1421, in D.K.R. xlii. 432, and Alington's fourth account, Exch. Accts. 188/7).

⁵ D.K.R. xlii., passim.

⁶ The retinues of the seneschal and the treasurer-general (see below, p. 243) must often have been on the move from one part of the duchy to another. A number of royal garrisons might be reinforced, when need arose, by the men of lords and soldiers on whom Henry had bestowed Norman lands. Thus, when the government gave the word, sixty landowners, at their own expense, had to rally with all their tenants and dependants to the defence of Rouen, sixty to that of Caen, and forty-three to that of Cherbourg.

addition, there were the garrisons of about sixty enfeoffed castles. As a rule it was for the tenant to decide how large a garrison to maintain; but, though most of these enfeoffed castles were small, few of them could have safely been left without a guard of at least ten men. It is known, furthermore, that recipients of Norman land from Henry were bound to furnish, at their own expense, mounted contingents totalling some 1400 men, who might be used anywhere and at any time. It seems safe to estimate, therefore, that, besides those paid by the king, there were in Normandy 2000 soldiers, nearly all of whom must have been English¹. The old feudal levy, though Henry asserted the right to employ it, was but little used², and it seems impossible to calculate the numbers it could yield.

The captains of the garrisons, royal or other, were almost all English. So were their lieutenants, an important consideration, for it often happened that a garrison captain was summoned to serve with the field army without being required to relinquish his command, and in that case the lieutenant became responsible for the defence of the town or castle concerned³.

¹ The conclusions just put forward are based on a number of authorities, the most important of which are the Norman Rolls, *passim*; For. Accts. 56, E v^o, 59, K, 61, B v^o sqq.; Exch. Accts. 187/14, 188/7; and Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 25,766, 26,043, 26,044, *nouv. acq.* 1482. It will be noticed that my calculations differ somewhat from those of Professor Newhall (*op. cit.* 216 sqq.). Having carefully studied his figures, both in his book and also in App. VIII of his typewritten thesis in the library of Harvard University (HU 90. 1215), I think that he has exaggerated the punctuality and regularity with which wages of garrisons were paid by the Norman Treasury, and has thus underestimated the numbers for which the disbursements on record were meant to provide. A more serious source of error is his pardonable omission to examine the original Norman Rolls; he has consequently left out of account most of the 1400 men due from the recipients of Norman lands, whose obligation to furnish troops is never indicated in the Calendar of Norman Rolls and rarely by Bréquigny, even when he prints parts of documents in which it appears. For the most part, of course, my authorities are the same as Professor Newhall's, though I have followed a different method in reaching my results.

² It was called up in the *bailliage* of Caen on March 16, 1418 (Newhall, 210, citing Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,042/5259), throughout the conquered territory in February and probably in April, 1419 (Newhall, 210, citing Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,042/5365; Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 65 d), in the Cotentin in June, 1419 (Bréquigny, 100), throughout the conquered territory in August and November, 1421 (Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 26 d; Bréquigny, 188) and perhaps in May, 1421, and January and April, 1422 (Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, mm. 12 d, 36 d; Rym. x. 201 sq.). The writs do not always make it clear to the modern reader whether the whole feudal host was concerned or only a part.

³ D.K.R. xli., xlii., *passim*; Exch. Accts. 50/10, 11, 12, 15; For. Accts. 61, B v^o sqq., 69, G, G v^o. With the possible exception of John Guernier (For. Accts. 61, C v^o; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 23), alias Gerner (D.K.R. xli. 751), captain of Tancarville in 1422, all the captains of royal garrisons seem to have been English, but one or two Frenchmen, notably Guy le Bouteiller, were feudal tenants of castles (D.K.R. xli. 797,

About the central government of Henry's conquests information is scanty, and insufficient to supply answers to many questions that suggest themselves. The whole area was at least nominally under civil rule, and the military, though their services were in frequent demand, were supposed to obey the civil authorities¹. The chief administrative official was the chancellor, John Kemp, bishop of Rochester, who, before Henry's death, was translated successively to Chichester and London². The Norman Chancery was established at Rouen³. Kemp was assisted by a clerk, John Stopynndon, who had charge of the Norman Rolls⁴, and there was a keeper of the hanaper of the Norman Chancery⁵, but contemporary records throw no further light on the personnel of its staff. The chancellor was of course responsible for the great seal of Normandy⁶; but he is seldom mentioned in contemporary records, and it is impossible to estimate how much influence he actually exerted on the course of administration.

In organising the central government of his French possessions, Henry could not make much use of existing institutions. He did not, however, look to England for inspiration. If he consciously imitated anything at all, which is not certain, it was the administration of Normandy in the days of the Plantagenets. Under Henry II, the most powerful official in Normandy had been the seneschal⁷. His office was suppressed

800). The lieutenants were presumably chosen by their respective captains, for their appointments do not appear in the Norman Rolls. We consequently do not possess a complete list of them. It is a further disadvantage that the arbitrary orthography of the Norman Chancery and Treasury sometimes leaves one in doubt as to the nationality of a man named in their records. It seems likely, however, that the following were French: John Jaquemyn, lieutenant of Gisors in May and September, 1421 (D.K.R. xlii. 425, 433; cf. xli. 772, xlii. 427), and Thomas Gargante, lieutenant of Château Gaillard in May, 1422 (Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 17 v^o). Peter "de Lye," lieutenant of Arques in April, 1421 (D.K.R. xlii. 428), whom I surmised to have been a Frenchman in my paper, "The Administration of Normandy, 1420-22" (Essays in Medieval History presented to Thomas Frederick Tout, 352, n. 5), proves on further investigation to have been Peter de Legh, an Englishman (Exch. Accts. 50/10, 15; Stowe MS. 440, f. 48; For. Accts. 69, G v^o; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 168, 249).

¹ Rym. x. 107.

² Ibid. 142, 151; For. Accts. 61, C v^o; Cal. Pap. Letters, vii. 161, 191; Le Neve, i. 245.

³ Rym. x. 155; For. Accts. 69, F. Apart from specific allusions the attesting clause of thousands of letters in the Norman Rolls is enough to establish the fact.

⁴ D.K.R. xlii. 437; For. Accts. 69, F.

⁵ Rym. ix. 686. In December, 1421, and in 1422 this office also was held by Stopynndon (Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 14 d).

⁶ Rot. Norm. 6 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 35 d; Rym. x. 195, 216 sq.; Rot. Parl. iv. 171 For. Accts. 69, F; Claus. 1 Hen. VI, m. 19 d.

⁷ Powicke, 70 sq.

after the duchy had been seized by the French crown¹. But even before the conquest of Normandy was complete Henry revived it, at least in name². What authority was attached to it at first we do not know; but after January, 1421, at all events, its importance was great; for Woodville's commission conferred on him the supervision of all officers, civil and military, in the parts subject to Henry. He was empowered to hold musters of garrisons whenever he saw fit, reporting thereon to the treasurer-general; to enquire into the adequacy of the food and munitions in fortified places; to investigate abuses of power by captains, punishing them himself unless they were serious, when he was to refer them to the Council. The seneschal, who might not delegate his functions, was to have a retinue of twenty men-at-arms and sixty mounted archers, and was to receive the substantial remuneration of 13*s.* 4*d.* a day³. Until November, 1421, Woodville was also captain of Gisors and Chaumont, and he apparently took an active part in the open warfare of the year, even as far afield as Maine⁴.

The seneschal, though a great man, did not enjoy that pre-eminence which had distinguished his office in the twelfth century. In particular, he was excluded from all concern with finance. The Norman Treasury remained at Caen⁵, despite the establishment of the Chancery at Rouen. The posts of treasurer-general and receiver-general continued for some time to be held by William Alington⁶. Alington had four *livres tournois* a day, with a bonus of £100 sterling a year, and was provided with an escort of eight mounted men-at-arms and twenty-four mounted archers⁷. He was responsible for the collection and receipt of most of the revenue of Henry's conquests⁸. He also

¹ Violet, *Institutions*, iii. 258.

² At any rate before July 14, 1419 (Bréquigny, 33). The document, though in the roll for 6 Hen. V, belongs to the following year, as the text itself shows (Rot. Norm. 6 Hen. V, p. 2, m. 1). Unfortunately the MS. is much damaged, and while a mention of the seneschal of Normandy is legible, his name has disappeared. We only know that in the following April the office was held by Hugh Lutterell (Rot. Norm. 8 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 28 d).

³ Bréquigny, 159 sq.; For. Accts. 59, K. Woodville's pay seems afterwards to have been reduced to 10*s.* a day (For. Accts. 61, B v^o).

⁴ For. Accts. 59, K; Bréquigny, 177.

⁵ Rym. x. 40, 203; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 25 v^o.

⁶ For. Accts. 61, B v^o; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 1. Alington's appointment, originally dating from May 1, 1419 (Bréquigny, 86; Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 77 d; Exch. Accts. 187/14), had been renewed on Nov. 13, 1420 (Bréquigny, 151).

⁷ Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 23 v^o, 25 v^o; For. Accts. 61, C v^o.

⁸ Exch. Accts. 188/7; For. Accts. 61, B v^o sq.; Bréquigny, 160; D.K.R. xlii. 429.

paid out money in accordance with royal writs, mostly under the privy seal, but it is evident that he was allowed some discretion in the disposal of the sums due from *vicomtes* and other collectors of revenue, much of which was applied to the needs of the locality where it was raised, without being sent to Caen at all¹. A few items of Norman revenue escaped Alington's cognisance, and were paid direct to Henry's treasurer of war²; they were not, however, of great significance. Alington was assisted by several tellers and a number of clerks, and by the summer of 1422 he had been relieved of the office of receiver-general, which was held by one John Dalton³.

The Treasury was subject to the control of the *chambre des comptes*, also located at Caen⁴, the distinction between the two corresponding roughly to that between the Exchequer of Receipt and the Exchequer of Account in England. There was a permanent president of the *chambre des comptes*⁵, and it is noteworthy that this office had long been filled by a Norman knight, Louis Burgeys, who, after being taken prisoner at the capture of Caen, had soon given his allegiance to Henry⁶. Alington's accounts for 1421 and 1422 mention Raoul le Sage, a knight with lands in Normandy and Picardy⁷, and Roger

¹ Exch. Accts. 188/7, *passim*; Bréquigny, 184; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, nos. 5677-9, 5735.

² For. Accts. 69, F, F v^o.

³ Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 24 v^o, 25, 27 v^o, 28 v^o, 32.

⁴ Rym. x. 40; Exch. Accts. 187/14, 188/7, f. 10 v^o; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, nos. 5639, 5649.

⁵ Rym. x. 32, 39. The office had existed as far back as Nov. 18, 1418 (Rot. Norm. 6 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 7 d).

⁶ Bréquigny, 193; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 28; For. Accts. 61, C v^o. He received his salary in full for the fiscal year beginning May 1, 1419 (Exch. Accts. 187/14), though he was not yet appointed to the presidency on May 3 (Brit. Mus. Add. Ch. 11,452). For the relations of Burgeys to Henry in the early days of the invasion, see Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 195, 375; D.K.R. xli. 760. In 1421-22 his salary was 200*l.t.* a year.

⁷ For. Accts. 61, C v^o. Cf. Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 198, 242; D.K.R. xlii. 378, 381; Bréquigny, 179, 180. Le Sage was hereditary marshal of Ponthieu and lord of St Pierre-Église (dep. Manche, arr. Cherbourg) and Laviers-le-Grand (dep. Somme, arr. Abbeville).—Luce, Chron. de Mont-St-Michel, i. 282 n., 314 n. 2; Demay, Inventaire, ii., no. 8141. In 1409 he was *maître des requêtes de l'hôtel* to Charles VI (Luce, op. cit. i. 282 n.). For some years prior to June, 1420, if not later, he was a councillor of the duke of Brittany (Blanchard, nos. 1321, 1348, 1364, 1401, 1403, 2663), and he had been engaged on the Breton side in the negotiations with Henry for the release of Arthur of Richemont (Rym. x. 2, 4 sq., 8 sqq.). He did not belong to the *chambre des comptes* until after May 1, 1420; indeed, he seems not to have made his peace with Henry till the summer of that year (D.K.R. xlii. 378). He received a "fee" of 100*l.t.* a year and a "reward" of 300 (For. Accts. 61, C v^o).

Waltham¹, described as *seigneurs de la chambre des comptes*, Yves de Bordenast and Benedict Couteiller, called *gentes de camera* in 1421-1422², and John Brinkeley, auditor of accounts³. To this body Alington had to account from time to time⁴. It evidently had a good conceit of itself, and on at least one occasion refused to accept a royal writ, presumably issued by the Chancery at Rouen⁵. After Henry's death, however, it was abolished, and the fiscal officers of Normandy once more came under the supervision of the *chambre des comptes* of Paris.

The most dignified military officer in the conquered lands was the king's lieutenant, Thomas Montagu, earl of Salisbury, whose authority, at first limited to regions south of the Seine, was extended over the whole area in November, 1420⁶. His powers are not very clearly indicated in the documents appointing him to his office; but it was his duty to defend Henry's territory against invasion, and he was apparently permitted to make counter-attacks on enemy country⁷. As lieutenant he seems to have had at his command a mobile force of some strength⁸. He was, too, captain of five castles near the

¹ Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 24 v^o. When first appointed, on April 7, 1419, Waltham was styled *magister* of the *camera compotorum* (Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, m. 55). In 1422 he had the same remuneration as Raoul le Sage (Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 24 v^o).

² For. Accts. 61, C v^o. Yves de Bordenast is no doubt identical with the Ivo "de Boiz de Vaast," who was *consiliarius* in the *camera compotorum* as early as March 11, 1418 (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 279). He and Couteiller each had 50*l. t.* a year. Cf. D.K.R. xlii. 336. When first appointed, on Jan. 19, 1420, Couteiller was, like Waltham, styled *magister* of the *camera* (Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, p. 2, m. 45). Couteiller was a Norman (D.K.R. xli. 738).

³ For. Accts. 61, C v^o; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 24 v^o. He had an annual "reward" of 100*l. t.* Cf. D.K.R. xli. 765. Brinkeley was appointed on April 12, 1419 (Exch. Accts. 187/14).

⁴ In Alington's commissions of May 1, 1419, and Jan. 24, 1420, it is laid down that as treasurer-general he is to account every year to the English Exchequer (Bréquigny, 86, 121). In each of the years 1420, 1421, and 1422, however, he received a special mandate to present his accounts to the *chambre des comptes* (Rot. Norm. 8 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 15 d, 9 Hen. V, m. 4 d; Bréquigny, 253; Exch. Accts. 187/14, 188/7, f. 1). His responsibility to the English Exchequer was nevertheless maintained, and to it his last account was presented (For. Accts. 61, B v^o).

⁵ Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5611. It was alleged by the *chambre des comptes* that what the writ ordered was counter to Norman custom.

⁶ Rym. ix. 739sq., x. 29; Bréquigny, 39, 177. He was often styled lieutenant of Normandy, even in official records, before his powers were extended over the whole duchy (cf. *e.g.* Rym. ix. 698; Bréquigny, 33, 57).

⁷ Rym. x. 131.

⁸ "Ses gens darmes et archiers de ses Retenues Si bien de luy en son dit office existant comme sur la sauvegarde desdites chasteaux et villes," Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 22. The large amounts which he received from the Norman Treasury indicate that he must have had to pay many men besides those of the garrisons under his command (*ibid.*; cf. For. Accts. 61, B v^o).

southern frontier¹. But neither the men of other garrisons nor the contingents due from feudal lords were under his orders, and if he wanted to draw upon them, he had to secure the intervention of the civil authority². His title of "lieutenant," indeed, is somewhat misleading, for Salisbury, even in strictly military affairs, was a great deal less than the *locum tenens* of the king. In fact, his authority over the English troops in Normandy and the annexed regions was ordinarily not so great as that of the seneschal.

Of the admiral of Normandy, the earl of Suffolk, there is little to say. He was invested with all the powers which the admiral of France had possessed within the duchy³, though the government was not quite sure what they were, and in January, 1421, had to commission Alington to enquire⁴. He was responsible for the safeguard of the coast⁵, but apparently performed his nautical functions by deputy, for he was also captain of the very important and exposed garrisons of Avranches and Pontorson⁶, and in September, 1421, became in addition governor of the marches of Lower Normandy⁷. As we shall see, he discharged his military duties in person and was also prominent in diplomatic work.

All officials alike were subject to Henry's Council at Rouen, sometimes called the *Grant Conseil*⁸. In the king's absence it directed the administration and defence of his French territory. The chancellor was its president⁹; the seneschal and the lieutenant doubtless belonged to it, though their attendance must have been irregular; the treasurer-general, however, seems not to have been a member¹⁰; and the only councillors whose names appear in the records of the last two years of the reign are

¹ Alençon, Essay, Exmes, Bonsmoulins, and Verneuil (Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 22; For. Accts. 61, B v^o). The total strength of the garrisons was 432 men (Brit. Mus. Add. Ch. 111; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 25,766, no. 797).

² Rym. x. 99, 201 sq.; Bréquigny, 177, 188; D.K.R. xlii. 457.

³ Rym. ix. 753. On the admiral of France, see Viollet, Institutions, ii. 444 sqq.

⁴ Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5594.

⁵ D.K.R. xlii. 323, 407.

⁶ He was appointed to Pontorson on June 12, 1419 (D.K.R. xli. 788) and to Avranches on Aug. 27, 1419 (ibid. 794).

⁷ For. Accts. 61, B v^o; D.K.R. xlii. 434.

⁸ Rym. x. 82, 142, 157; Bréquigny, 175, 179, 184; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 26; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5740.

⁹ Rym. x. 142; Exch. Accts. 50/9.

¹⁰ "Cancellario et Consiliariis nostri Magni Concilii et Scaccarii in Ducatu Normanniae, ac etiam gentibus compotorum nostrorum et Thesaurario" (Rym. x. 142).

Raoul le Sage¹, already noticed as a member of the *chambre des comptes*, and Master (or Doctor) Thomas Brons². The councillors permanently retained in Henry's service were apparently few, but, if occasion required, they might of course be re-inforced by any of his subjects whom he chose to summon.

A matter of some mystery is the fate of the Norman *Échiquier*, an institution highly prized by the Normans as the most notable survival of the organs of ducal government. Though maintained by Philip Augustus and his successors, the *Échiquier* had in course of time changed greatly in both character and functions. Originally the *curia ducis*, with a close resemblance to the contemporary *curia regis* of England, it had become a court of the king of France, subordinate, first to the *Parlement* of Paris, and afterwards partly to that body and partly to the king's *chambre des comptes*. For by the end of the fourteenth century, if not earlier, it was divided into two branches—the *Échiquier des causes* or *Échiquier ordinaire*, the functions of which were primarily judicial, and the *Échiquier des comptes*. Both were held twice a year, the former by delegates of the *Parlement* of Paris, the latter by members of the royal *chambre des comptes*, who received and audited the accounts of the fiscal officials of Normandy³. Now for the years 1417-1422 records of the Norman *Échiquier* are wholly lacking, and it has been inferred that in the days of Henry V it ceased to exist, though the *Échiquier ordinaire* was revived by the duke of Bedford in the first year of his regency⁴.

This view seemed to be confirmed when the Calendar of the Norman Rolls from 1418 to 1422 was published. There the word Exchequer is of frequent occurrence, and, except when the English Exchequer is meant, it plainly refers to the financial authority set up by Henry at Caen. Now if this institution, a very different thing from either branch of the *Échiquier normand*, was officially termed Exchequer, one would naturally suppose that the *Échiquier normand* had ceased to exist. The truth is, however, that in the Calendar the word

¹ For. Accts. 61, B v^o; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 26; Bréquigny, 179, 180. He had a retaining fee of 1000*l.t.* a year. He was apparently made a councillor during Henry's visit to Normandy in January, 1421 (Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 26).

² For. Accts. 61, C v^o. He received 6*s.* 8*d.* a day for his services as councillor. Cf. p. 201.

³ On the twelfth-century *Échiquier*, see Powicke, 67, 85, and on the *Échiquier* in the later Middle Ages, see Floquet, *Parlement de Normandie*, i.; Viollet, *Institutions*, iii. 344 sq., 379 sq.

⁴ Floquet, i. 220 sq.

Exchequer, when applied to a Norman institution, is always a deplorable translation of *camera compotorum* or its French equivalent¹. In the Norman Roll of 5 Henry V, there is indeed one passage where the word *scaccarium* is used with apparent reference to a financial institution². But the document belongs to a date very early in the English conquest; the word is never used again in a parallel context³; a few weeks previously it had figured in a most important commission with quite a different meaning⁴; and in all probability its use with reference to a fiscal organ was due to the inadvertence of an English clerk, familiar with the significance of *scaccarium* in England.

The financial authority at Caen, then, was officially called the *camera compotorum* or *chambre des comptes*, not the *scaccarium* or *Échiquier*. But there still was something in Normandy called the *scaccarium*, though allusions to it are rare. On Nov. 1, 1417, John Tiptoft was appointed president of the Norman *scaccarium* and other judicial tribunals in the duchy, and also treasurer-general in the same duchy and other places subject to Henry⁵. Now here the *scaccarium* is a judicial institution, and it appears that the functions of its president are specifically distinct from those of the treasurer-general. Four months later, on Feb. 27, 1418, the *scaccarium* appears in the documents granting Clarence jurisdiction and lands in four *vicomtés* of Lower Normandy: its functions are again regarded as judicial⁶. It figures, also as a judicial institution, in the grant of privileges to Dieppe, dated Jan. 1, 1420, and the consequent mandate of the following July 24⁷. And on July 14, 1421, a

¹ This is the case in D.K.R. xli. 683, 688, 689, 715, 716, 719, 721, 748, 792, xlii. 319, 320, 323, 336, 355, 372, 381, 392, 393, 437, 439, 448. In Alington's account for 1419-20, "les chequiers" in England is expressly contrasted with the "chambre des comptes" in Normandy (Exch. Accts. 187/14. Cf. also Rot. Norm. 8 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 15 d, 9 Hen. V, m. 4 d; Bréquigny, 253).

² Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 220. Grant of the wardship of certain lands at an annual rent of four *livres tournois* to be paid "ad scaccarium nostrum Cadomi." The date is Dec. 22, 1417.

³ Cf. e.g. Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 260; Rym. ix. 623.

⁴ See the following paragraph.

⁵ "Sciatis quod nos de probitate... Johannis Tiptoft plenam fiduciam optinentes constituimus ordinavimus et prefecimus ipsum presidentem nostrum tam in scaccario nostro Normannie quam aliis pro tribunalibus sedibus judicialibus quibuscumque et ubicumque infra ducatum nostrum predictum necnon thesaurarium nostrum generalem infra eundem ducatum et aliis locis ditioni nostre subjectis" (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 205). Professor Newhall has involved himself in some perplexity and confusion (p. 168, n. 112, p. 169, n. 118) by his failure to notice that Tiptoft was appointed treasurer-general as well as president of the *scaccarium*.

⁶ Rot. Norm. (Hardy), 259, 318.

⁷ Rym. ix. 832; Bréquigny, 145.

writ was addressed to the chancellor and counsellors of the great council and *scaccarium* in the duchy of Normandy and likewise the *gentes compotorum* and treasurer¹. In this case again there is an express distinction drawn between the *scaccarium* and the financial authorities. Here, however, it is closely associated with the Council; indeed, it is implied that the personnel of the two is the same. Now the Council directed the administration, and issued ordinances in the king's name. What functions were left for the *scaccarium* save judicial ones? In this relation, furthermore, it is worth noting that on June 8, 1422, Jacques de Calez was appointed king's counsel in "notre court souveraine" at Rouen²; for the "sovereignty" of their *Échiquier*, earnestly asserted by the Normans in 1315, had been conceded in their famous charter³; and a manuscript of 1480 mentions "la court souveraine de l'Eschiquier de Normandie"⁴. Slight though the evidence is, it warrants, I think, the conclusion that the *scaccarium* of the records just cited was the old *Échiquier des causes*, now conducted by Henry's councillors and presumably presided over by the chancellor. Henry, of course, could not continue the practice of having its proceedings conducted by delegates of the *Parlement* of Paris, and, for that matter, the subordination of the *Échiquier* to the *Parlement*, though well established at the beginning of the fifteenth century, was contrary to the Norman charter of 1315. That the business of the *Échiquier* was conducted by the king's Council might have been commended to the Normans as an approximation to the state of affairs under the dukes of the twelfth century; but there is no reason to suppose that Henry ever thought of it in that light. As for the *Échiquier des comptes*, its functions were exercised by the *camera compotorum* and the Treasury⁵; here no attempt was made to preserve the institution existing at the time of Henry's invasion; but the *Échiquier des comptes* was a comparatively new organ of administration⁶, and it cannot be supposed that its suspension caused any widespread discontent. It is significant that the conciliatory Bedford, while he bestowed on the *Échiquier des causes* an independence which

¹ "Cancellario et Consiliariis nostri Magni Concilii et Scaccarii in Ducatu Normanniae, ac etiam gentibus compotorum nostrorum et Thesaurario..." (Rym. x. 142).

² D.K.R. xlii. 449.

³ Viollet, *Institutions*, ii. 246, iii. 345; Floquet, i. 96 sqq.

⁴ Viollet, *op. cit.* iii. 345, n. 2.

⁵ Exch. Accts. 188/7; For. Accts. 61, B v^o sqq.

⁶ Viollet, *op. cit.* iii. 379.

it had not enjoyed since the thirteenth century, made no attempt to revive the *Échiquier des comptes*¹.

What part Henry meant to allot to the Estates of the conquered territory it is impossible to say for certain. He summoned them only once; but it would have been idle to call

¹ Floquet, i. 225, 239. Under Bedford the *Échiquier des causes* was held by commissioners of the king, not by delegates of the *Parlement* of Paris.

The early growth of the organisation described above is very obscure, owing partly to lack of evidence and partly to the ambiguity of the word Exchequer. Dr Wylie gave little attention to the subject; Professor Newhall's account is impaired by his failure to notice several relevant documents—a failure due, it seems, to that disregard of Rymer which is too common among modern historians; and M. Roger Doucet's article, "Les Finances Anglaises en France à la Fin de la Guerre de Cent Ans" (Le Moyen Age, ser. II, xxvii. 265 sqq.), adds nothing of consequence to Professor Newhall's researches on Henry V's finances, and is marred by much inaccuracy. What happened cannot, I fear, be precisely ascertained; but it may be useful to bring together the salient facts on record, even though most of them have already been mentioned. Perhaps such a summary will suggest to others conclusions which I have been unable to deduce.

On Nov. 1, 1417, John Tiptoft was appointed president of the *scaccarium* and other judicial tribunals of Normandy and also treasurer-general of the duchy (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 205). On March 11, 1418, there is the first extant reference to the *camera comptorum* (Rot. Norm., Hardy, 279), which is frequently mentioned in the following months (Rymer, *passim*). On April 8 came the appointment of Philip Morgan as chancellor (*ibid.* ix. 571). John Golafre became receiver-general on May 20 (D.K.R. xli. 710; cf. Mirot, Dom Bévy, 357, though the eighteenth-century inventory there cited was evidently drawn up carelessly), and under the same date Tiptoft is styled "president and treasurer" of Normandy (Rym. ix. 588. It is to be noticed that he is not called "president of the Exchequer"). On Nov. 18, 1418, comes the first express mention that I have found of the president of the *chambre des comptes* (Rot. Norm. 6 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 7 d—writ to "president et gentibus de camera nostra comptorum"). Though in the next few months more than one document is addressed to the same official, his name is never given (*ibid.* m. 3 d, p. 2, mm. 38 d, 46 d). That he was John Tiptoft, who was still sometimes called "president of Normandy," is, however, shown by a record of the following May (Brit. Mus. Add. Ch. 11,452; cf. Exch. Accts. 187/14). On the 3rd of that month Tiptoft, though "president of Normandy," is no longer styled treasurer, William Alington having been made treasurer-general and receiver of Normandy on May 1 (Bréquigny, 86; Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 77 d). Tiptoft, moreover, must soon afterwards have been succeeded by Burgeys in the office of president (Exch. Accts. 187/14). Golafre, hitherto receiver-general, evidently made trouble (Rot. Norm. 7 Hen. V, p. 1, m. 77 d; cf. Mirot, *loc. cit.*), but on June 21 handed over the money in his possession (Exch. Accts. 187/14). By July 14 there was a seneschal of Normandy (see above, p. 243) and with the gradual extension of the lieutenant's authority over the whole duchy (see above, p. 245), the framework described above became complete. It should not be overlooked, however, that though Alington united in his person the offices of treasurer- and receiver-general for a long time, there was in 1422 a separate receiver-general, who seems, however, to have been only a subordinate official (Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 25 v^o, 27 v^o).

It may be conjectured that at first, whatever titles Tiptoft might bear, there was little differentiation in practice between departments of government. Then, just as in twelfth-century England, it became necessary to create a body that specialised in finance—hence the *chambre des comptes*. A little later a chancellor was appointed, and it seems probable that he took charge of general administration and justice, while Tiptoft, who remained treasurer, was now president, not of the *scaccarium*, but of the *chambre des comptes*. When, on the fall of Rouen, Upper Normandy came under Henry's rule, the task of the central authorities became far greater. The seneschal was appointed to lighten some of the burdens of the chancellor, while the functions of the president of the *chambre des comptes* and of the treasurer-general were placed in separate hands.

them together either before or after the occasion on which they actually met, and it is to be remarked that Henry did assemble them at the first opportunity after the treaty of Troyes. The business transacted on this occasion was, as we have seen, of the highest moment, and the Estates seem to have been courteously and considerately treated by Henry. It is to be noted that he did not attempt to levy direct taxes on his French subjects except with the consent of the Estates. The indirect taxation imposed by previous French kings he nevertheless considered himself free to exact without any show of consent on the part of the payers, and since 1419 he had been collecting the *gabelle*, the *quartages*, and *imposicions foraines*¹. Probably he preferred to raise money and to shape policy with the countenance of his subjects, to whom, as long as they were amenable, he was ready to give opportunities of expressing their views on the needs of the region under his sovereignty: but it would be foolish to suppose that he would ever have suffered any abatement of his authority out of regard for so-called popular rights.

Whatever may be thought of Henry's arrangements for the government of Normandy, he cannot be justly accused of wantonly disregarding the susceptibilities of the inhabitants. Not only were the lower administrative posts filled almost entirely by Frenchmen—mainly, no doubt, Normans—but there were Frenchmen at the Treasury², in the *chambre des comptes*, and on the Council. There was no attempt to make Normandy an English colony. Many officers and men of Henry's army received lands forfeited by defiant Normans, and at Harfleur, Honfleur, Caen, and Cherbourg a number of houses were granted to English settlers³; but the English element thus introduced was very small in relation to the total population. Nor did Henry try to establish a spiritual garrison of English clergy. Among the very numerous appointments to ecclesiastical offices or benefices which are recorded in the Norman Rolls for 1421 and 1422, there are only twenty in favour of men with what seem to be English names, and but three of these concern parish churches⁴. It need hardly

¹ Bréquigny, 89 sq., 130, 252. On these impositions, see pp. 75, 195, 258.

² Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 28 v^o, 32.

³ D.K.R. xli., xlii., passim.

⁴ Ibid. 410, 414, 422. One of the benefices in question was the chaplaincy of a garrison, which consisted of English troops (ibid. 399). Two governorships of hospitals, the treasurership of Rouen cathedral, the archdeaconry of Le Neubourg, and eight cathedral or collegiate prebends were filled by Englishmen (ibid. 396, 398, 410, 411, 414, 415, 420, 421, 422).

be added that no attempt was made to alter existing law and custom¹.

After Henry's departure for England, the energies of the Norman government were largely devoted to maintaining order in the conquered territory and providing for its defence against organised attack. If it was to succeed in either task, however, the money voted by the Estates must be collected and the promised reform of the currency accomplished. Henry had decided that the first instalment of the *taille*, amounting to 100,000*l. t.*, was to be paid by March 1. The treasurer-general informed each *vicomte* of the sum expected from his sphere of jurisdiction. He in his turn, consulting the king's *procureur*, the *sergents* of the *vicomté*, and perhaps a few others, apportioned the required sum among the *sergenteries* and then among the parishes. The burden was distributed among individuals by assessors, generally, if not always, men of the parish concerned, who were appointed by the *vicomte* or his representative. Their list was given to two collectors, also men of the parish, who were responsible to the *vicomte*. The basis of the levy was a tax of 20*s. t.* on every hearth. "Hearth" meant in practice a head of a family, but it is evident that there was much guess-work in the apportionment of the total among the *vicomtés*, *sergenteries*, and parishes, or else that a conventional scheme was followed, for it was only after the contribution of a parish had been fixed that it was ascertained how many of its inhabitants were liable to be taxed. Then, if 10*l. t.* were to be found, ten "hearths" were assessed at various sums, averaging 1*l. t.*, to make up the total². Other heads of families were classed as poor or mendicants³ and escaped contribution. It is plain that the incidence of taxation must have varied greatly from place to place. Further, it is evident that many Normans contributed to one or two instalments of the *taille* and not to the rest. Thus, since the second levy of 60,000*l. t.*⁴, like the first of 100,000, was assessed

¹ This is well illustrated by a petition of the executors of William Bouchier, count of Eu, in which it is assumed that the government will follow Norman custom as to the heritability of wardships if only it can ascertain what the custom is (Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5611).

² C. Beaurepaire, États, 120 sq., 178 sqq.; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 25,907, passim, 26,044, nos. 5658-62; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 11 v^o sqq. The assessors and collectors were sometimes elected by the parishioners with whom they were to be concerned.

³ C. Beaurepaire, États, 179, 181; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 25,907, no. 1168 et passim.

⁴ Bréquigny, 181 sq.

at the rate of 1*l. t.* a hearth, 40,000 families who had paid the first escaped the second¹. And a very large number were never required to pay anything at all. For instance, in the parishes of Bouaffles and Mousseaux twenty-eight were exempt from paying the second instalment, while three contributed², so that even when Henry demanded 120,000*l. t.* all at once, those who escaped outnumbered those who paid by twenty-five to six. This was no doubt an exceptional case, but other examples indicate that the number of exempt was very high³.

Considering the haste with which the collection was made, the government were probably lucky to get 85,000*l. t.* of the first instalment by Aug. 20⁴. They were, however, disappointed when the first levy of the clerical tenths, which was made in May, yielded only 12,000*l. t.*, and next month the bishops and vicars-general called in the aid of the secular arm, ecclesiastical censures having failed of their effect⁵. At the same time a second levy of the lay grant, designed to produce 60,000*l. t.*, was made; before Aug. 20 it brought in 55,000*l. t.*⁶ It is to be noticed, however, that in April the value of the coin called the *gros* had been officially reduced from 20*d. t.* to 5*d. t.*⁷, so that the sums raised in May were really very much greater than those collected as the first instalment. Nevertheless, the inhabitants were still under the obligation of finding nearly 250,000*l. t.* In August, Henry, recognising that to raise this

¹ Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 25,907, nos. 1014, 1110, et al.

² Ibid. no. 1168.

³ Thus, even when the heavy first instalment was being collected, the parish of Epéard had nine exempt *feus* as against ten which paid, while in the case of the adjacent parish of Marbeuf the figures were ten and eighteen (C. Beaurepaire, *États*, 178 sqq.). Professor Newhall (op. cit. 186) seems to have underestimated the number of exempt, and to have overlooked the fact that while in January, 1421, Henry demanded 100,000*l. t.*, in August he demanded 120,000. I do not think that the extant documents relating to the *taille* are of much service in an attempt to estimate the total population of Normandy at this time.

⁴ Bréquigny, 181 sq. Arrears of the first instalment continued to be collected during the following winter (Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 25,907, nos. 1206, 1208, 1263 et al.).

⁵ Bréquigny, 182; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 17 v^o; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5634. In Bréquigny, 182, March is named as the month in which the first instalment of the clerical tenths was levied; but the other authorities cited show this to be a slip for May.

⁶ Bréquigny, 181 sq.; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 25,907, no. 1014 et passim; Rym. x. 101. Professor Newhall is mistaken (p. 175, n. 150) in supposing that the 12,000*l. t.* from the clergy was included in the 55,000*l. t.* Had this been so, 260,000*l. t.* would still have been payable.

⁷ Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 17 v^o; Bréquigny, 182, 253; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 25,907, no. 1174; Chron. Rouennaise, 343.

at one stroke would be excessively harsh, announced that the laity should discharge their dues in two further instalments. The first of these, which was to produce 120,000*l. t.*, was to be raised at once¹. How much it yielded cannot be precisely computed, but a comparison of the various records relating to the subject suggests that about 70,000*l. t.* came in². Included in the final instalment was to be the second half of the clerical tenths and the arrears of the first, which were considerable, the secular officials having been slack in coercing the dilatory³. But before any of this was collected, the government reduced the value of the *gros* from 5*d. t.* to 2½*d. t.*⁴, and thus made still more formidable the task of paying what remained due. On Dec. 14 the bishops were ordered to raise the second instalment of the clerical tenths, and the attempt began in January, 1422⁵. It encountered great opposition, and even when the civil power once more intervened in support of the ecclesiastical authorities⁶, the results were derisory. By May 1 less than 1000*l. t.* had been collected, and though in the following four months over 5000*l. t.* were paid in, the total was of course far less than had been looked for⁷. It is also worth noting that of this 5000*l. t.*, 3400*l. t.* came from the diocese of Rouen alone, and that in the same period nothing whatever was received from the dioceses of Évreux, Sées, Bayeux, and Avranches⁸. Still more disheartening was an attempt made in April, 1422, to collect in the diocese of Bayeux arrears of the tenth which the Norman clergy had voted to Charles VI shortly after the English landed at Touques⁹: for there is no record in Alington's accounts of any receipts from this source. It is evident that the favour with which Henry had at first been regarded by the clergy wore thin as soon as material sacrifices were demanded of them.

¹ Bréquigny, 182; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, nos. 5658-62.

² From May 1, 1421, to Aug. 31, 1422, Alington received 168,000*l. t.* from the *taille* on the laity (Exch. Accts. 61, B v^o). Of this, we are told, 55,000*l. t.* was raised as the second instalment (Bréquigny, 182). From May 1 to Aug. 31, 1422, the *taille* brought in 50,000*l. t.* (Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 17). Some of this doubtless represented arrears of the third instalment, the yield of which would thus appear to be approximately 70,000*l. t.*

³ Bréquigny, 182; Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 9 d.

⁴ Bréquigny, 189.

⁵ D.K.R. xlii. 434; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 17 v^o.

⁶ Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 9 d.

⁷ For. Accts. 61, B v^o; Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 17 v^o, 18; Bréquigny, 182.

⁸ Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 17 v^o, 18. In the dioceses of Évreux, Sées, and Avranches no one was willing to collect the money (Chron. Rouennaise, 343, n. 1).

⁹ Rym. x. 203.

The indifferent success of the attempt to collect the third instalment of the lay grant apparently convinced Henry that what remained due had best be raised in two further stages. Thus, an instalment, designed to yield 60,000*l. t.*, was demanded in May, 1422¹; and from the beginning of that month to the end of August Alington received 50,800*l. t.* from the collectors, part of this amount no doubt representing arrears of instalments levied on easier terms². That the collection of this sum was attended by serious difficulties is shown by the fact that in July, 1422, the Council at Rouen granted a respite until Christmas to the inhabitants of the county of Ivry, who had protested their inability to pay owing to dauphinist raids³. Yet another instalment was raised after Henry's death, but how much it produced is not known⁴. So far as can be ascertained, Henry obtained about 270,000*l. t.* out of the promised 400,000*l. t.*⁵ In the circumstances, the result does credit to the zeal and efficiency of the officials concerned with the collection of the money.

The problem of the currency, to judge by Henry's proclamations, was approached with great confidence by the government. The coinage in circulation, mostly from French mints, was extremely bad, and prices were exorbitant⁶. Henry promised to issue good money, and, as we have seen, the Estates consented to a levy of silver, which was to be made before Feb. 15⁷. For some time, at all events, the *baillis* took little notice of the ordinance enjoining the payment of the impost⁸, and there seems to be no means of judging how far it was obeyed. Before new coinage could be issued, it was of course necessary to regulate the value of the money actually in circulation. In April, therefore, the common silver coin called the *gros* or *royal*, the exchange value of which had of late been 1*s.* 8*d. t.*, was officially proclaimed to be worth only 5*d. t.*⁹ The gold noble was to be equivalent to 40*s. t.*, the gold crown to 30*s. t.*,

¹ D.K.R. xlii. 449; Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 10 v^o. It was due at Michaelmas, 1422 (Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 25,907, no. 1308). Arrears were still coming in during February, 1423 (ibid. no. 1331).

² Exch. Accts. 188/7 ff., 10 v^o, 17.

³ Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5740.

⁴ Newhall, 176.

⁵ Bréquigny, 181 sq.; For. Accts. 61, B v^o; Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 17, 18.

⁶ Chron. Rouennaise, 343.

⁷ Bréquigny, 162.

⁸ Ibid. 168 sq.

⁹ "Chescun piece de monoye presentement appelle et ayant cours pour gros ou ryal sera prise et baille pour un petit blanc vaillant v deniers tournoysoulement," Bréquigny, 253. Cf. Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 1.

and the coin popularly styled *mouton d'or* to 20s. *t.* All commodities were to be priced in terms of the *petit blanc*¹, a coin worth 5*d. t.*, to which the *gros* in circulation was now deemed equivalent.

On May 6, 1421, the keepers of the mints of Rouen and St Lô were ordered to set to work on the new coinage. This was to consist of a gold coin worth 22*s. 6d. t.*, and a silver *gros* and *demi-gros*, the former worth 1*s. 8d. t.* The quality of the coins was to be good². The production of the new money, however, was delayed by many hindrances. The hereditary guild of coiners in Normandy was not able to furnish enough workmen, and it was decided in July that new coiners should be appointed with only a life-interest in the craft³. More serious still were the doings of the dauphinist mints, which were producing vast quantities of base coins, similar in appearance to the *gros* being made in Normandy, with a face value of 1*s. 8d. t.*, though intrinsically they were worth far less⁴. It soon became certain that they would drive the new money out of the country. Meanwhile, despite the government's regulations, the gold noble was being accepted as equivalent to 20*l. t.* and the gold crown as worth 10*l. t.* The continued badness of the money circulating, together with the attempts of the authorities to alter its exchange value, gave rise to much confusion and caused catastrophic fluctuations in the wealth of individuals⁵. On Nov. 30 therefore the government admitted the failure of its plans and had recourse to new measures. The current *gros* were now to be valued at only 2½*d. t.* The gold crowns last struck in France were to circulate at 22*s. 6d. t.*, the *moutons* at 15*s. t.*, English gold nobles at 45*s. t.*⁶ A comparison of these regulations with those of the previous April enables one to form an idea of the confusion that must have reigned in the trade of Normandy. Simultaneously it was announced that, instead of

¹ "Toutes denrees, vitailles, et autres marchandises soient ramenez audit pris du petit blanc qui se vendoit un gros dessusdit," Bréquigny, 253.

² Sixty-four gold coins were to be given for the mark of gold, and the silver coins were to be "sur la pes de monnoye xxx^{me}" (Bréquigny, 175 sq.). It is not known whether any of the gold coins were ever made. The *gros* ordered is known to numismatists as the *gros au léopard*. It was never circulated and is very rare (J. Bailhache, "La Monnaie de St Lô," *Revue Numismatique*, 1925, pp. 71 sq.; Dieudonné, *Bibl. de l'Éc. des Chartes*, lxxii. 498). For pictures of it, see Hoffmann, Pl. XXIX, 5; Hewlett, Pl. XII, 7. The latter wrongly ascribes the order for its issue to 1420. No examples of the *demi-gros* have been found.

³ Bréquigny, 254.

⁴ *Ibid.* 189.

⁵ *Chron. Rouennaise*, 343.

⁶ Bréquigny, 188 sq.

the money that had been promised, there would be issued gold *saluts*, worth 25s. t., and half-*saluts*, and coins called *doubles tournois*, made of a silver-coated alloy and worth 2d. t., together with demi-doubles or *petits deniers*¹. The small coins were put into circulation early in 1422, but, though their current value was made to correspond with their intrinsic value, were not regarded with much favour². The reduction in the value of the *gros*, followed by the demand of the government that all taxes should be paid in "forte monnaie"—that is to say, according to the value officially attributed to the various coins—caused great indignation³.

It cannot be claimed that Henry's attempt to reform the Norman currency met with much success. Parallel efforts at Paris, as we shall see, were no more fruitful. Indeed, until the authorities at Rouen and Paris were able to coin sufficient good money for the needs of the areas under their jurisdiction, to make it the sole legal tender, and to exclude counterfeit money, the best-laid schemes of monetary reform, however terrifying the sanctions whereby they were supported⁴, could not but fail. Meanwhile, the abortive attempts greatly irritated public opinion. It must be recognised, however, that Henry's measures were a step in the right direction, and he deserves praise for having checked the reckless debasement of the coinage to which France had long resorted when in financial trouble.

Notwithstanding difficulties in collecting the *taille* and improving the currency, the finances of Normandy, as revealed by the treasurer-general's account for the last sixteen months of the reign⁵, were less unsatisfactory than might have been expected. Despite restorations and gifts of landed property, the income from the royal domain and from regalian rights over churches and abbeys remained large, amounting to

¹ Bréquigny, 189; Dieudonné, lxxiii. 263; Bailhache, op. cit. 73 sq. There are pictures of the *salut* (an excellent coin), *double*, and *petit denier* in Hoffmann, Pl. XXIX, 4, 11, 12, and in Hewlett, Pl. XII, 4, 10, 11, where the issue is misdated.

² Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 64; Chron. Rouennaise, 343. The intrinsic value of one of the new coins was more than five times as great as that of a coin of the same denomination belonging to the old currency (Rym. ix. 920; Bailhache, op. cit. 69, 73 sq.).

³ Ibid.

⁴ Those who contravened the ordinances on currency or did anything calculated to frustrate them were liable to very severe penalties (Bréquigny, 189, 253).

⁵ For. Accts. 61, B v^o sqq. We have also a draft account of Alington's, incomplete but entering into greater detail, for the last four months of the reign. It is rarely safe to use this as the basis of exact calculations, but it affords much information of very high value (Exch. Accts. 188/7). Alington's account for 1420-21 somehow got to the *chambre des comptes* in Paris, where it still existed in the eighteenth century (Miro, Dom Bévy, 357). It was probably burned at the Revolution.

79,95*l. t.*, and the revenue under this head for the twelve months beginning May 1, 1421, was greater by 3000*l. t.* than that for the corresponding period of 1419-1420¹. From May, 1421, to August, 1422, the salt-garners yielded 64,045*l. t.* The *quartages* and the *impositions foraines* produced 47,556*l. t.* The *taille* brought in 168,092*l. t.*, the ecclesiastical tenths 18,992*l. t.* Altogether in these sixteen months Alington accounted for 388,942*l. t.* under the head of receipts². Nor must it be forgotten that many towns received Henry's permission to levy "aides" on their inhabitants³. These were generally taxes on sales, especially of beverages; and from the proceeds the townfolk were as a rule required to keep the fortifications of the place in repair⁴, often to defray the cost of municipal government⁵, and sometimes to pay the wages of the captain of the garrison⁶. Frequently these imposts were farmed at auction, but sometimes, at any rate, account had to be rendered to a royal official⁷. It is not possible to compute the amount raised by such local taxes, but it is evident that a considerable part of the sum they produced was devoted to purposes which would otherwise have made demands on the Norman treasury.

During the period May, 1421, to August, 1422, the total expenditure of Alington was returned as 396,915*l. t.*⁸ There was thus an adverse balance of nearly 8000*l. t.* This, however, was rather apparent than real. In the total expenditure were included 23,000*l. t.* lost to the treasury owing to the depreciation of the current coinage⁹; while 32,000*l. t.* were spent on the purchase of oxen and sheep for Henry's household¹⁰, and 72*l. t.* on the safe-keeping of prisoners from Meaux¹¹. Further, sums amounting to 19,900*l. t.* were paid direct from Norman sources to William Philip, Henry's treasurer of war after Oct. 1, 1421, without coming within Alington's cognisance¹².

¹ For. Accts. 61, B v^o; Exch. Accts. 187/14, 188/7, f. 5.

² For. Accts. 61, B v^o. The total is that given by Alington, but the account has been carelessly entered on the roll and the several items if added together yield a different figure.

³ In 1421 and 1422 (up to Henry's death) such "aides" were levied by Pontoise (Rym. x. 55), Falaise (ibid. 51; D.K.R. xlii. 447), Dieppe, Gaillefontaine, Montivilliers, Carentan (Rym. x. 51 sq.; Bréquigny, 195, 201), Neufchâtel, Vire (Rym. x. 51 sq.), Gisors (Bréquigny, 147 sq.), Argentan (ibid. 160, 196), Louviers (ibid. 174 sq.), Caen (ibid. 195 sq.), Rouen (ibid. 197 sq.), Bayeux (ibid. 198), Mantes (D.K.R. xlii. 438), Lisieux (Newhall, 172, n. 134).

⁴ See e.g. Rym. x. 51 sq., 55; Bréquigny, 174 sq., 197 sq.; D.K.R. xlii. 438, 447.

⁵ Rym. x. 51; Bréquigny, 197, 198.

⁶ Ibid. 174 sq., 197 sq.

⁷ See e.g. Bréquigny, 195, 198.

⁸ For. Accts. 61, D.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid. C v^o.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² Ibid. 69, F.

It is thus evident that Normandy easily supported itself. This, it is true, was due to the *taille*; but even without the *taille*, the revenue had increased since 1419¹.

On the other hand, the accounts of Alington and Philip lend no colour to the belief that in Henry's last years the burden of paying for his military operations was mainly borne by Normandy². Alington's accounts are concerned with all the important sources of Norman revenue, and Philip could not have drawn directly on any of these without throwing the financial administration of the conquered territory into hopeless confusion. Of the money which Alington expended, all save 32,000*l. t.* was devoted to the administration and defence of Normandy³. As for Philip, he acknowledges the receipt from the issues of the great seal of Normandy, from the Rouen indemnity⁴, and from profits of the Rouen mint, of the 19,900*l. t.* already noticed, and he also states that part of a sum of £5200 sterling came from Norman officials⁵. There is no reason to suppose that the Norman contribution to the latter was large. The remainder of Philip's receipts were drawn almost entirely from the English Exchequer⁶, and what little was not derived thence came in all probability from the revenues of the French crown⁷. All things considered, it is unlikely that the contribution of Normandy and "the Conquest" to the cost of Henry's campaigns and sieges after his return to France in June, 1421, came to more than 70,000*l. t.*, or between £10,000 and £11,000. And on the other side of the account is to be set a contribution, probably amounting to more than £1000, made by Philip to the cost of building Henry's new palace at Rouen, and repairing and equipping the castle there⁸.

¹ From May 1, 1421, to April 30, 1422, Alington's receipts, exclusive of the *taille* and clerical tenths, came to 191,538*l. t.* For the corresponding period of 1419-20, they totalled 160,437*l. t.* (For. Accts. 61, B v^o; Exch. Accts. 187/14, 188/7, ff. 2 sqq.).

² "From 1418 on, the real burden of the war was being gradually shifted to Normandy," Newhall, 151; cf. *ibid.* 243. For a somewhat similar view, see Mowat, 260.

³ It is true that the 59,000*l. t.* received by the earl of Salisbury and the 13,000*l. t.* received by Ralph Butler (For. Accts. 61, B v^o, C) were probably spent in part on military operations outside Normandy, but these were largely defensive in purpose (see below, pp. 313 sq., 354 sq.).

⁴ For. Accts. 69, F.

⁵ *Ibid.* F v^o.

⁶ See below, pp. 390 sq.

⁷ One would naturally have assumed that Henry used these for his own purposes, even if the duke of Burgundy had not afterwards made it a grievance (La Barre, i. 341).

⁸ For. Accts. 69, I.

No doubt it was disappointing to Henry that Normandy was unable to give him more help. And, for that matter, when Alington's accounts are analysed closely, they suggest that there was much amiss in Henry's conquered territories. In the first place, it was obviously difficult to raise revenue in the frontier *bailliages*. Of the 79,900*l. t.* derived from the "domain" in sixteen months, over 40,000 came from the *bailliages* of Rouen and Caen. These two furnished 49,000*l. t.* of the 64,000 yielded by the salt-garners, and 32,000 of the 47,000 produced by the *quartages* and *imposicions foraines*. Their share of the *taille* was not so notable; yet they contributed 72,000*l. t.* of the 168,000 raised from the eight *bailliages*. Under these four heads, the total yielded by Rouen was 105,000*l. t.*, by Caen 90,000. In striking contrast are Gisors, which produced in all 13,000*l. t.*, Évreux, which yielded 8300*l. t.*, Alençon, whence came 32,600*l. t.*, of which 28,700 were accounted for by the *taille*; and Mantes, which contributed 5100*l. t.* Caux and the Cotentin, two comparatively well-protected *bailliages*, produced respectively 40,400*l. t.* and 46,800*l. t.*¹

Rouen and Caen might be expected to yield more revenue than any of the other *bailliages*, but their natural advantages cannot explain so great a disparity between them and their neighbours. And the impression left by the figures just cited is confirmed when one turns to the details of expenditure. By far the greater part of the money raised in Normandy was, as we have seen, spent there. That so little could be spared for Henry's needs elsewhere was due to the military establishment in the conquered territory, which cost upwards of 291,000*l. t.* during the last sixteen months of the reign². That the earl of Salisbury should have required 59,000*l. t.* is not surprising; nor was 15,500*l. t.* an excessive wages bill for the earl of Suffolk, in command on the exposed Breton frontier³, still less was 13,200*l. t.* for Ralph Butler, who, as will be seen, was entrusted with arduous duties on the borders of Vimeu⁴. But it is somewhat astonishing to find that the garrison of Rouen cost 15,800*l. t.* from May, 1421, to Henry's death, and that in 1422 it numbered 240 men; that the garrisons of Cherbourg and Regnéville required jointly 11,702*l. t.*; that Caen, the

¹ For. Accts. 61, B v^o. The pre-eminence of Rouen and Caen was not so marked in 1419-20 (Exch. Accts. 187/7).

² For. Accts. 61, C v^o, D.

³ Ibid. B v^o.

⁴ Ibid. C.

defence of which cost 10,600*l. t.*, needed in the summer of 1421 a garrison of 121 men; and that at the same time Harfleur was held by 160¹. It is evident that the force which was maintained in Normandy at the beginning of 1421 cannot have been much reduced before the end of the reign and that the English felt insecure even in districts remote from the frontier.

The difficulties of the authorities in the conquered territory arose not merely from attacks by external enemies—which indeed were frequent and formidable—but also from internal disorder. How ubiquitous and continual this was appears from testimony of very various kinds. When Henry was at Rouen in January, 1421, it was unsafe for an official of the duke of Exeter to journey thence to Thury Harcourt². This same personage, the *vicomte* and *receveur* of La Carneille in Exeter's county of Harcourt, found it next to impossible to collect his lord's dues during the following years. Into many parts of his sphere of jurisdiction he dared not go. The whole area was terrorised by "brigands"; agriculture was gravely hindered, minor official posts could not be filled, and when rents were collected, it was only with the support of English soldiers from the garrison of Falaise³. The region in question is hilly and offered many advantages to fugitive rebels; but it was some way from the frontier, was never reached by dauphinist raiding parties, and had within it Falaise, one of the most notable strongholds of Normandy. The acts of the Rouen government, furthermore, betray the extent of open disaffection. Immediately after Henry's departure for England the export of grain from Normandy was forbidden because Normans had been selling it to Compiègne, Dreux, Meaux, and other dauphinist garrisons⁴. On June 4, 1421, all holding land of the crown were ordered to appear before the chancellor or the treasurer-general by midsummer⁵. Some three weeks later, enquiry was to be made concerning Normans who had broken their oath of allegiance to Henry and joined the enemy or turned brigands⁶. In August it was decreed that all the goods of rebels in the conquered lands should be sold for the advantage

¹ For. Accts. 61, C; Exch. Accts. 50/3, 6, 9.

² Chatel, Inventaire des Archives départementales. Calvados. E 1, p. 169.

³ Ibid. pp. 167 sq.

⁴ Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5595.

⁵ D.K.R. xlii. 429.

⁶ Bréquigny, 178.

of the king¹. Apparently the dauphinist successes of the early summer had emboldened many Normans to reveal their true feelings towards Henry. Sometimes they left their wives in charge of their estates, and on Dec. 2 the government proclaimed that all women whose husbands refused the oath must join them within eight days, and that their possessions were to be seized². This was followed by an ordinance, dated Dec. 8, that all inhabitants of the conquered lands should swear allegiance by Feb. 2, 1422, on pain of being declared incapable of holding property within the area concerned, a measure which indicates that the number of rebels had of late increased and that the authorities were loth to proceed to extremities³. In February an inquisition was ordered into the property of absentees⁴. But the measures taken seem not to have had much effect. On Jan. 1, 1422, the keeper of the seals of recognisances in the *vicomté* of Auge was given permission to reside at Lisieux because of the prevalence of brigandage⁵. Between May 1, 1421, and the end of the reign, rewards were paid for 386 brigands captured and convicted⁶, ninety-nine being paid during the last four months of Henry's life⁷.

The country lying immediately to the south-west of Rouen seems to have been more infested than other regions, and in the summer of 1422 some of the inhabitants of the *vicomtés* of Pont-Audemer, Auge, and Orbec petitioned that a special police force might be maintained there at the expense of the population. In July, therefore, the Rouen authorities allotted to the area in question forces totalling forty mounted and seventy unmounted men, whose duty would be the hunting of brigands. Each *vicomte* concerned was to consult the nobles and other important men in his sphere of jurisdiction; if they were favourable, the inhabitants were to be assessed to provide the wages of both officers and men⁸; otherwise, it seems, the *vicomté* would have to forgo their services. Evidently those who defied the English authorities were not always popular with their fellow-

¹ D.K.R. xlii. 431.

² Bréquigny, 230.

³ Rym. x. 159.

⁴ D.K.R. xlii. 437.

⁵ *Ibid.* 436.

⁶ For. Accts. 61, C v^o, D. The person responsible for the capture of a brigand subsequently executed received *6l. t.*

⁷ Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 30 sq. The victims came from all parts of the duchy. Only 152 "brigands" had been executed in 1419-20 (*ibid.* 187/14). The increase, however, may have been due to greater efficiency on the part of officials rather than greater lawlessness.

⁸ *Bibl. nat.*, Portefeuilles de Fontanieu, 111-112, ff. 260 sqq.

countrymen, and indeed Normans often helped to capture disturbers of the peace¹.

The difficulty of collecting the clerical tenths, noticed above, revealed a temper among the clergy which comes to light in various authorities. At the beginning of 1421, only the bishops of Sées, Coutances, and Avranches had accepted Henry². None of the obdurate bishops ever gave way; but Martin V had just provided Nicolas Habart to Bayeux, and he took the oath of fealty, receiving almost all his temporalities after some delay³. The shortage of bishops made it difficult to remedy the shortage of lower clergy⁴. In March, 1421, the government renewed its attempt to constrain to residence those ecclesiastics who remained in dauphinist territory and refused the oath to the treaty of Troyes⁵; and in the summer the bishop of Bayeux was rebuked for his remissness in dealing with such⁶. On May 1, 1422, the government asserted that many Norman clergy, pretending that they had sworn to the treaty, passed freely to and from dauphinist regions, their revenues, when they were absent, being kept for them by sympathisers; and it was laid down that all benefice-holders were to furnish the ecclesiastical authorities with written evidence of their having taken the oath, while none were to leave their dioceses without letters testimonial of their bishops or to visit dauphinist regions without the special licence of the king⁷. In the following August, however, it was officially admitted that many of the clergy in the diocese of Bayeux had not yet sworn loyalty to Henry or to the treaty⁸.

The extent of the disaffection and disorder must not be exaggerated. After, as before, January, 1421, the rolls contain hundreds of names of Normans who have sworn the required oath and received back their possessions⁹. There are still, too, numerous records of the submission of religious houses, with

¹ Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5701; Exch. Accts. 188/7, ff. 30 sq.

² Rym. x. 84 sq.

³ Ibid. 147, 150 sq., 157, 172; Gams, 507; Eubel, i. 127. Paul de Capranica, whom in 1420 Martin V had provided to Évreux, never appeared in Normandy during Henry's life (Eubel, i. 244; Rym. x. 143, 147).

⁴ Denifle, i. nos. 1030, 1031. It should be remembered that bishops in all parts of France used the troubles of the time as a pretext for absenting themselves from their sees (ibid. i. 569).

⁵ Rym. x. 84 sq.; cf. Brown, Fasc. Rer. Expetend. II. viii. sq.

⁶ Rym. x. 147.

⁷ Ibid. 209.

⁸ Ibid. 235 sq.

⁹ D.K.R. xlii., passim. The dating of the lists is not sufficiently precise to admit of

consequent restoration of their property and confirmation of their charters; and scores of Norman clergy were willing to comply with the conditions attached to preferment by Henry¹. Nor does it appear that the English authorities provoked insubordination by tyrannous conduct. On the contrary, they did what they could to prevent the excesses which are perhaps inevitable when a large body of soldiery is quartered in a foreign land. A few days after Henry left Rouen, a proclamation was issued admitting that some of the English had been guilty of extortion and forbidding the acceptance of gratuities by the porters of towns or castles, the levy of horses or merchandise save with the consent of the owner, or the arbitrary exaction of passage money by the captains of fortified posts². These articles were afterwards repeated and supplemented³, and there can be no doubt that the authorities at Rouen were seriously concerned, if only for reasons of policy, to keep the troops well in hand. Nor do contemporary writers complain of the behaviour of the English soldiers or officials. They disliked the heavy taxation, grumbled at the attempted reforms of the currency, and lamented the scarcity of victuals in 1421; but it is admitted that next year, despite a terrible drought, conditions were better⁴. Nevertheless, it cannot be pretended that the English brought order and prosperity to the regions they had conquered. In the autumn of 1421, the abbot of Bec asserted that the neighbourhood had been largely depopulated and agriculture suspended, though it must be recognised that it was to his interest to exaggerate⁵. It was officially stated in 1422 that wolves had greatly increased in Normandy since its conquest by Henry⁶—striking testimony to the dislocation that had befallen rural life. Yet it would be rash to suppose that conditions in Normandy were more anarchical than elsewhere in France. Disorder was endemic in all mediæval countries; and civil strife intensified it as quickly and surely as foreign invasion. There is at all events no evidence that the prevalence of "brigandage" was caused by outraged nationalism.

an exact computation of the numbers concerned, but there were considerably more than a thousand. Most of them were of humble rank. A number of esquires appear, but few of higher status.

² Rym. x. 57 sq.

¹ Rym. x., passim; D.K.R. xlii., passim.

³ Ibid. 106 sq., 112, 160 sq.

⁴ Chron. Rouennaise, 344 sqq.; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 63.

⁵ Denifle, i. no. 1034.

⁶ Rym. x. 224.

CHAPTER LXVIII

HENRY'S LAST VISIT TO ENGLAND

IN the previous autumn it had apparently been expected in England that the king would return before Christmas, a hope that was not altogether abandoned when parliament met on Dec. 2¹, 1420. In his opening speech the chancellor recognised the general desire for Henry's presence; and when they became convinced that he would not arrive in time to meet them, the commons petitioned Gloucester to urge him and Catherine to come as soon as they could². The temporal lords present were identical with those who had attended the parliament of 1419³; there were returns for thirty-seven counties and eighty-three boroughs⁴, and in the absence of writs *de expensis*, we are not tempted to speculate as to the number of members who were actually present. The Speaker was Roger Hunt, esquire, one of the members for Bedfordshire⁵. There seems to have been a feeling that in the circumstances it was vain to attempt much business, and the parliament must have been one of the dullest on record. There was no request for money. The chancellor said that the English people had special cause to thank God because of the favour which He had shown to their king, who desiring above everything the prosperity of the realm and considering the distress and poverty into which his subjects had of late fallen, mainly through the scarcity of money in the land, wished the commons, with the advice of the other estates, to apply their minds to the provision of remedies⁶. It cannot be claimed that their deliberations were very fruitful. Several of the common petitions aimed at securing a supply of the precious metals for the mints; two of them were embodied in the short statute of the year⁷, but cannot have produced much effect.

¹ Parliament was summoned on Oct. 21 (Rept. Dign. Peer, iv. 845); the first common petition (Rot. Parl. iv. 124) contemplates the possibility of the king's arrival during the session.

² Ibid. 125 (no. II).

³ Rept. Dign. Peer, iv. 843, 846.

⁴ Return Parl. i. 294 sq.

⁵ Rot. Parl. iv. 123; Return Parl. i. 294. He had been returned for Hunts. in November, 1417, and in 1419 (ibid. 289, 292).

⁶ Rot. Parl. iv. 123.

⁷ Ibid. 125 sq. (nos. III, IV, VII, X); Statutes, ii. 203.

Among the other petitions was one which asked for the revival of a treaty whereby the counts of Flanders were supposed to have forbidden their subjects to import any save English wool¹, another which, alleging that the king and his progenitors had been lords of the sea and pointing out that he now ruled both coasts of the Channel, proposed that all foreigners using it should be required to contribute towards its defence², and a third which asked for further protection for English ships in northern waters in view of the depredations of the Scots, who had been taking troops to France and wool to Flanders in captured English vessels³. All these were answered evasively, that is to say, refused. More interesting and creditable are three petitions in which the commons show concern lest the king's new status in France should prove derogatory to the interests of England. It was ordained in response to one that neither this parliament nor any summoned in future by a regent should be dissolved by the arrival of the king in England during its proceedings⁴. The commons further begged for the re-enactment of the statute of 1340 which declared that the realm of England should never be in subjection to the crown of France, the reply being that the statute should be maintained⁵. Some of the lords had asserted that the petitions presented by the commons to Gloucester were to be sent overseas to be dealt with by the king, and the regent was asked to ordain that all such petitions should be disposed of within the realm during parliament, any left unanswered at the dissolution to be treated as void, a rule which was to hold good in all future parliaments⁶. This suggestion was politely refused, but it was a sound instinct that prompted the commons to make it.

It was perhaps on Jan. 19 that Henry left Rouen on his journey to England⁷. The staff of his chapel had left ten days before and were already across the Channel⁸, and the equipment of the king's chamber was sent by sea to Southampton⁹. It is therefore not likely that Henry's choice of route was due

¹ Rot. Parl. iv. 125 (no. v).

² Ibid. 126 (no. vi).

³ Ibid. 127 (no. xi).

⁴ Ibid. 124; Statutes, ii. 203.

⁵ Rot. Parl. iv. 127 (no. xiv). The statute in question is incorrectly cited in the printed Rolls of Parliament; it is Statute iii. of 14 Edw. III (Statutes, i. 292).

⁶ Ibid. 128 (no. xvi).

⁷ The number of important appointments dated Rouen, Jan. 18, suggests, though it does not prove, that Henry was still there on that day (Rym. x. 49 sq.; D.K.R. xlii. 397, 398), and he can hardly have reached Amiens in less than two days.

⁸ Proc. Priv. Co. ii. 326.

⁹ Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., 17 Feb. 1421.

to the insecurity of the Channel; probably he wished to see for himself the state of affairs at Calais and to gauge the feeling of the populace in the region between that town and Normandy. Accompanied by Catherine, the king of Scots, the duke of Bedford, the Earl Marshal, the earls of March and Warwick, and a substantial force of fighting men, he passed rapidly through Caux, and on Jan. 21 arrived at Amiens. Here he met with an honourable welcome, rich gifts being offered to Catherine and himself, and was lodged in the house of the newly-appointed *bailli* Robert le Jeune, a strong partisan of the English, in whom Henry was believed to have much confidence¹. Thence he made his way through Doullens, St Pol, and Th  rouanne, being politely received everywhere². When he approached Calais, the merchants of the Staple and the clergy came forth at the head of the townfolk in festal array, bearing precious gifts for the queen³. After some days Henry set sail with a favouring wind and on Feb. 1 landed at Dover, where he was welcomed tumultuously by vast crowds from the adjacent country and by many nobles from remoter parts⁴. Some of the barons of the Cinque Ports, indeed, were so carried away by enthusiasm that they rushed into the sea and bore Henry and Catherine to land on their shoulders⁵. The royal party at once went forward to Canterbury, to be received there too by exultant crowds with rich presents⁶. Devotional exercises and sight-seeing doubtless occupied the next few days, and then Henry, who regarded time as a precious gift of God (as one of his biographers apologetically explains)⁷, went on to London without Catherine. He was probably at Westminster by Feb. 8⁸. He was welcomed, we are told, with great ceremony

¹ Monstr. iv. 24; Fenin, 151, 190 sq.; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 64; Vita, 295; Wals. ii. 336; Durand, i. 53. Le Jeune had taken the oath as *bailli* on Dec. 30, 1420 (Fauquembergue, i. 391).

² Monstr. iv. 24; Fenin, 151; Vita, 295.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Exch. Accts. 106/25; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 318; Wals. ii. 336; Vita, 295 sq.; Monstr. iv. 24; Brut, ii. 425.

⁵ Vita, 296.

⁶ Wals. ii. 336; Brut, ii. 425; Northern Chron. (Kingsford, Lit.), 289.

⁷ Vita, 296.

⁸ Several London chroniclers, whose information on the point doubtless comes ultimately from a common source, give Feb. 14 as the date of Henry's arrival in London (Brut, ii. 492; Kingsford, Chron. 127; Gregory, 138; Chron. Lond. 108; Fabyan, 586); but under Feb. 8 the Issue Roll records a payment made to a recluse at Westminster by command of the king *ore tenus*, and also the payment of the expenses of a messenger sent with a letter *de signeto* from London to Plymouth. This, indeed, is not decisive evidence that the king had reached Westminster by the date in question, but it points strongly to that conclusion.

and joy¹, but the official festivities were deferred for the arrival of the queen.

On Friday, Feb. 21, Catherine, who had reached Eltham and been met there by Henry², set out thence for London. The mayor and aldermen awaited them on Blackheath, attended by a vast number of London craftsmen clad in white with red hoods or caps, each gild having its distinguishing badge, while clarions and "all maner of lowde mynstrelsie" attested their loyalty³. The concourse escorted Catherine to the city, which had exerted to the full its ingenuity in her honour. The splendour and pageantry, indeed, seem to have been scarcely inferior to the display which celebrated the victory of Agincourt. The author of the *Vita Henrici Quinti* calls up his last resources of verbiage and bombast in his endeavour to describe the scene. Giants guarded the city gates and bowed in reverence as the queen entered. Lions rolled their eyes. Here was a row of castles manned with armed warriors, there were gleaming thrones encompassed with chanting angels. Bands of apostles, martyrs, confessors, and virgins sang a melodious welcome. The conduits ran with wine; the streets were strewn with green branches, the houses hung with costly draperies⁴. Through these bewildering manifestations of friendliness Catherine was led to the Tower⁵, where she passed the night. Next day, clad in white, she was carried to Westminster in a gorgeous coach, attended by a procession of noblemen, city magnates, and craftsmen in their best clothes, the streets being decked as on the previous day⁶.

On Sunday, Feb. 23, Catherine was crowned in the Abbey church by Archbishop Chichele⁷. She was then led into the palace and enthroned⁸. Afterwards "alle maner rialtees of metis and drynkys" were to be had in the palace for the asking⁹.

¹ Vita, 296; Wals. ii. 336.

³ Ibid. 426.

⁵ Brut, ii. 426.

⁷ Brut, ii. 427; Wals. ii. 337; Vita, 299. Titus Livius (91) says that Henry was eager to have the queen crowned because "sine coronatione proventus dotis possidere non poterat." This explanation is of course false, as Henry had waived all claim to a dowry (see above, p. 198). The date of the coronation is not quite certain. The prelates and magnates had been ordered to be at Westminster on the third Sunday in Lent—Feb. 23—when the coronation was to be held (Rym. x. 63; cf. Devon, 364), but only two chroniclers state that it actually took place on that day (Chron. Lond. 108; Kingsford, Lit. 289). However, several writers who give other dates say that the ceremony was performed on a Sunday (Wals. ii. 336 sq.; Brut, ii. 426 sq., 445, 563), and no other Sunday will suit the facts.

⁸ Vita, 300.

² Vita, 296; Brut, ii. 426, 492.

⁴ Vita, 297 sq.; Strecche, 278 a.

⁶ Ibid.; Vita, 299; Wals. ii. 336.

⁹ Brut, ii. 427.

There was also a solemn banquet in Westminster Hall, which seems to have made a great impression on the citizens of London who received invitations, for one of them, and probably more, preserved the menu and made elaborate notes of the proceedings and the arrangement of the tables. It would have been contrary to etiquette for Henry to be present, for the seat of honour belonged that day to Catherine. On her right sat the archbishop and the bishop of Winchester, who were served next after her; on her left was King James, who was served after the two prelates. The remaining seats at the high table were occupied by four countesses. The duke of Gloucester, who was "overlooker" of the feast, stood before the queen bare-headed, while to right and left of her knelt the earls of March and Stafford bearing sceptres. The absence of many great men in France made it necessary for several honorific functions to be performed by deputy. Thus, the earl of Warwick took the place of the duke of Clarence as Steward of England, while his own office of panter was filled for the occasion by Lord Clifford. The earl of Worcester performed the duties of the Earl Marshal and rode about the hall on a great charger, keeping order with the aid of a number of tipstaves. Notwithstanding the war, however, there was an impressive attendance of the English nobility. Bedford was present in his capacity of Constable of England; the earls of Northumberland and Westmorland were among the supervisors of the feast; while mere barons were too numerous to count. Besides the high table there were four others. The outer one to the queen's right was occupied by the benchers of Chancery and the barons of the Cinque Ports. At the next table sat ten bishops, the abbot of Waltham, the judges, and a number of ladies, knights and esquires. The third table seems to have been occupied entirely by ladies, those accounted noble sitting at the upper end. At the table on the extreme left, "next unto the cupborde," were the mayor, aldermen and notable citizens of London¹. As it was Lent the meal consisted almost entirely of fish and confectionery², and the royal cooks had devised a most elaborate bill of fare, in which, besides

¹ The foregoing description is based on the accounts of Brut, ii. 445 sq.; Chron. Lond. 162 sqq.; Gregory, 139 sqq.; Fabyan, 586 sq. They differ in details but agree on nearly all important points. Most of their information is evidently derived from a common source.

² Brawn with mustard, evidently served as a *hors d'œuvre*, was the only dish in which meat appeared.

whale and porpoise, there figured almost every denizen of fresh or salt water that is ever seen on a modern table¹. There were three courses, and after each there was served one of those "subtleties" which were the pride of the mediæval pastrycook².

After Catherine's coronation Henry made a hasty tour of the chief towns in his kingdom. On Feb. 27 he was at St Albans³. He then visited Bristol and other towns in the neighbourhood⁴. On March 7 he was at Weobley in Herefordshire, on March 11 at Shrewsbury⁵. Thence he went to Kenilworth, where he stayed at his manor of Plesantmaris, which he had reclaimed from a swamp⁶. By March 15 he had been joined by the queen, who had travelled from London through Hertford, Bedford, and Northampton⁷. On that day they were at Coventry, where the city gave them handsome presents⁸. They then went to Leicester, remaining there over Easter and for some days afterwards⁹. Important political

¹ The menu, which is of great interest to the angler as well as to the student of manners and customs, is given in Brut, ii. 447; Chron. Lond. 164 sq.; Gregory, 141; Fabyan, 586 sq. Fabyan's version is the fullest. On Feb. 17, £46. 13s. 4d. had been paid for fish for the queen's coronation (Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 17, 1421).

² The best description of them appears in Chron. Lond. 164 sq. The first "soteltie" was "a pellican on hire nest with briddis and an ymage of St. Katerine with a whele in hire hande disputyng with the Hethen clerks, having this Reason in hir hande, Madame la Roigne; the Pellican answeryng Cest enseigne; the briddes answeryng Est du roy pur tenir joie. A tout gent il met sentent." At the end of the second course came "a Sotelte, a panter with an ymage of Seint Katerine in the same tariage (sic) and a whele in hire hand, and a Reason in hire other hand. The Reason was this: La Roigne ma file. The panter answeryng In cest Ile: another best answeryng with this Reason, Of Albion: another best saiying, Aves Renowne." The third subtlety is described thus: "A Tigre lokyng in a mirour and a man ridyng on horsebak armed with a tigre whelp in his barne, and throwyng mirours for his defence; and a Reason writon, Par force saunz Droit Jay pris ce best. Another Reason for thanswere of the Gile de mirour Ma fait discour."

³ Newhall, 266.

⁴ Strecche, 278 a; Rym. x. 97.

⁵ Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 1365/28, 29. It would appear from the acknowledgment by Oldcastle's captors, printed in Orig. Lett. ii. i. 88—a correct transcript from Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 24 d—that Henry was at Shrewsbury on March 4. If that were so, he could hardly have visited Bristol, as there is good reason to believe he did; and in any case it would be hard to see why he should have gone to Weobley by way of Shrewsbury and why he should have visited the latter town twice. Perhaps the document was drawn up and dated some days before it was sealed in the king's presence.

⁶ Strecche, 278 a; J. Rous, Hist. Regum Angliæ, 209.

⁷ Strecche, 278 a.

⁸ Cov. Leet, i. 34; Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 667/993.

⁹ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 362; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 335, 336, 362, 370; Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 667/994, 998-1000; Strecche, 278 a; Vita, 300 sq.; Wals. ii. 337.

business was, it seems, the cause of the length of their stay. For part of the time, at any rate, the king of Scots was in the town¹; two messengers from Charles VI came thither, though we do not know their errand²; and Henry was probably joined by John Stafford, keeper of the privy seal³, and perhaps by the chancellor, who was certainly with him at a later stage of his wanderings⁴. Whatever business was on foot, it was not sufficiently urgent to require Henry's presence in London. On leaving Leicester, he and Catherine went by way of Nottingham and Pontefract⁵ to York, which they reached by April 2. They were welcomed with great magnificence and presented with splendid gifts, and the dean and canons placed their houses in the Minster close at the disposal of some of the great people who accompanied Henry, an act of hospitality which he formally declared was not to be taken as a precedent. He stayed at York for a few days, transacting business⁶; then, leaving Catherine behind, he paid flying visits to the shrines of Bridlington and Beverley⁷. When he had gone a short distance from Beverley, he met a messenger with letters telling of the battle of Baugé⁸, the peril of his French conquests, and the desire of his friends overseas for his speedy return. With the self-control which was the marvel of those who knew him, he said nothing about the news till next day, when he told the magnates who were with him. He and the rest agreed that his speedy return to France with a powerful force was essential, and he at once wrote to his officials and captains overseas assuring them that he would soon be back and charging them on pain of death not to neglect their duties or to allow any fortified place to fall into the hands of the enemy⁹. Henry, however, did not allow the concern that he must have felt to betray itself in his movements. After rejoining the queen at Pontefract¹⁰, he went to Lincoln, where he attended the installation of the

¹ Devon, 366.

² Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., March 11, 1421.

³ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 362; Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 667/994, 998-1000. Cf. *ibid.* 1365/28, 29; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 404.

⁴ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Easter, April 1, 1421.

⁵ Strecche, 278 a.

⁶ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 335, 337, 342, 363, 407; Rym. x. 96 sq.; Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 668/1001-4, 1156/2.

⁷ Northern Chron. (Kingsford, Lit.), 290; Vita, 304; Strecche, 278 b.

⁸ Vita, 304; Northern Chron. 290.

⁹ Vita, 304 sqq.

¹⁰ Kingsford, Lit. 290.

new bishop, Richard Fleming¹, and was present on April 15 when the bishop gave his decision as arbitrator in certain long-standing disputes between the dean and the chapter². He later visited Lynn, Walsingham, and Norwich on his way to London³.

Why did Henry undertake this devious journey? The best English authority for this part of the reign indicates that its purpose was mainly devotional and benevolent: the king visited a number of holy places and shrines, offering generous gifts, and also heard the complaints of the poor and did justice to the oppressed⁴. This is no doubt true, but Henry was an adept at combining religion with politics, and we may well believe Monstrelet when he represents Henry as an assiduous propagandist during his tour, explaining to his subjects what had been accomplished in France and asking for money and men to complete the work by the overthrow of the dauphin, who still held two-thirds of the country⁵. At Bristol and in Yorkshire, and no doubt in the other places he visited, Henry negotiated loans for the payment of the troops he was about to take to France⁶. It is well to bear this in mind, for many modern writers give the impression that after the treaty of Troyes a spirit of arrogant optimism seized Henry, that he visited England in a holiday mood, and that the news of Baugé came like a bolt from a clear sky and completely changed all his calculations and plans. As a matter of fact, Henry had already promised Charles VI and his French supporters that he would return by midsummer with reinforcements⁷, and on April 7, that is to say, before he had heard of Clarence's defeat, he appointed commissioners in the North and West Ridings of Yorkshire and in Bristol to summon persons who had not yet lent money to the king and induce them to do so, seeing that he was about to return to France and would not have time

¹ Northern Chron. (Kingsford, Lit.), 290; Strecche, 278 b.

² Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 404; Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 668/1005, 1006.

³ Strecche, 278 b.

⁴ Vita, 300; cf. Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., March 11, 1421, where there is recorded the issue of £333. 6s. 8d. for the king's offerings and charitable gifts during his journey.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 25.

⁶ Rym. x. 96.

⁷ That Henry gave such a promise was stated by himself a few months later (Brit. Mus. MS. Cotton, Cleop. E. ii, f. 353 b); that it was given before he heard the news of Baugé appears from a letter written on April 7 by Charles VI to the people of Rheims (Le Moyen Age, Sér. II., xxi. 14: the letter is also printed in Le Cabinet Historique, i. 59).

to raise by ordinary means enough to pay the troops who were to accompany him. His composure on hearing of the disaster and the deliberation of his subsequent movements are thus less astonishing than they at first appear. He had never meant his stay in England to be long; measures had already been taken for raising money and men; and there was no need for him to make hurried changes in the arrangements for the next few weeks. There is no reason to suppose that Henry underestimated the difficulties that still confronted him after the signing of the treaty of Troyes. His conduct after that event, as well as before it, was marked by great political sagacity. The catastrophe of Baugé was of course unexpected, but, had it never occurred, Henry would probably have acted very much as he in fact did.

The commissions for raising the loan which had been issued on April 7 were followed a fortnight later by others applying to fourteen counties and the town of Northampton¹. Through two or three² of the counties Henry had probably passed, though there is no evidence that he stayed in them, but most of them he had not visited at all. In the counties where he had been able to explain his needs by word of mouth, he perhaps now relied upon verbal negotiations or appointed agents under the signet or privy seal. At any rate it is certain that the demand for loans was not limited to the counties where commissioners were appointed by letters patent³.

There was indeed urgent need of money. At Lambeth on May 6 the treasurer submitted to Henry, in the presence of his principal ministers and councillors, a statement of the kingdom's finances⁴. The ordinary revenue—apparently for the past year—he put at £55,700⁵. Of this, indirect taxation yielded £40,600, £26,000 of which was derived from the subsidy on wool. The remaining £15,100 came from the sheriffs, and from feudal incidents or similar windfalls. On

¹ Rym. x. 97 sq.

² Berks, Oxfordshire, and Wilts.

³ We know of a commission appointed for Norfolk and Suffolk and of loans made by the men of those counties, though the commission was not enrolled among the letters patent (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 365; Rec. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 10, 1421).

⁴ The document is written in a contemporary hand and preserved in Cotton MS. Cleop. F. iii. It is printed in Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 312, and, inaccurately, in Rym. x. 113 sq.

⁵ I give only round numbers, but the nature of the sums quoted in the original shows that, when dealing with revenue, the treasurer was reporting actual receipts. On turning to expenditure, however, he plainly abandons fact for prophecy.

the other side of the account, the expenses of government, apart from the war in France, would demand £52,200. The items contributing to this total are some of them astonishing. £9100, it was reckoned, would suffice for the administration of England. If the war continued, Calais would demand £19,100 and the defence of the Scottish border £9500. Ireland, on the other hand, would require only £1666. Annuities payable at the exchequer or chargeable on the customs would come to £12,000. Then follows an alarming list of expenses to be met out of the balance of £3500. There were the royal household, the chamber, the wardrobe¹, the king's ships, the keeper of the lions and constable of the Tower, munitions, prisoners, envoys and other messengers, and the duchess of Holland²; while there were outstanding debts of various departments of government, of Henry IV, and of the king when prince of Wales.

In these circumstances it was of vital moment that the response to the demand for loans should be prompt and generous. In having recourse to a loan rather than to parliamentary taxation, Henry was doubtless influenced, as he said, by the necessity of getting money quickly, but he probably knew also that grave discontent would be caused, and his prestige seriously damaged, if he demanded a grant from parliament just when the nation believed that the treaty of Troyes would usher in a period of peace and enable the king to lighten the burdens of his subjects. On the whole his policy was justified by results. Over £38,000 was received by May 13³. It is true that £17,666 of this came from Bishop Beaufort⁴, who a few weeks later lent a further £2000⁵, and that the remainder was a good deal less than would have been yielded by the usual parliamentary grant of a fifteenth and a tenth. The money, on the other hand, came in quickly; the cost of collection must have been small; and as the clergy not only contributed to the loan but also voted a tenth in their convocations⁶, Henry probably got about as much in the end as if he had appealed to parliament. It is evident from the wording of the letters patent appointing

¹ The "camera regis et reginae" and the "garderoba regis et reginae" appear in the list as though distinct from their "hospicium."

² Jacqueline of Hainault: see below, pp. 290 sqq.

³ Rec. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 10, 13, 1421.

⁴ Ibid. May 13, 1421; Rot. Parl. iv. 132; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 372.

⁵ Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 42.

⁶ Wilkins, iii. 399, 403.

commissioners to negotiate with possible lenders that considerable pressure was applied to individuals¹. Those who were slow in fulfilling their promises were peremptorily ordered to pay up or appear before Henry or the Council²; but, to judge from the scanty evidence on the subject, such delinquents were not numerous. The Council was authorised by parliament to give such security as it thought fit³. Of the money lent by Bishop Beaufort, £14,000 was secured on the customs at Southampton⁴. Many lenders were immediately granted assignments on the clerical tenth or the next parliamentary grant. The clergy contributed liberally to the loan; but little, if anything, was offered by the lords temporal. A vast number of small contributions, however, came from knights, esquires, and lesser folk, and several shires and towns sent a lump sum⁵.

The meeting of parliament just as the money was beginning to come in shows that Henry was quite free from apprehension lest the raising of the loan should arouse opposition on constitutional or legal grounds. The writs of summons had been issued on Feb. 26, nearly a month before the battle of Baugé. The bishops, twenty-three abbots and the prior of Coventry, the duke of Gloucester, the earls of Northumberland, Westmorland, Warwick, Worcester, March, and Devon, twenty other lords temporal, and ten justices were summoned individually⁶. Seventy-two knights and 176 burgesses figure in the Sheriffs' Returns⁷, but how many attended we have no means of telling. It must have been a fairly experienced parliament. In only five cases did a shire elect two men who had never been returned, and forty of the county members had been chosen at least once before. Only nineteen boroughs out of eighty-seven selected two novices, and one hundred of the borough representatives had been elected on at least one previous occasion since Henry's accession⁸. Henry was present

¹ Rym. x. 96.

² Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 280.

³ Rot. Parl. iv. 130.

⁴ Ibid. 132 sqq.; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 372.

⁵ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 12, 14, June 28, 1421; Rec. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 10, 13, 14, 1421. Queen Catherine lent £1333. *6s. 8d.* (ibid. May 13, 1421).

⁶ Rept. Dign. Peer, iv. 849. No summons was sent to the abbey of St Augustine's, Canterbury, the papal confirmation of the election of Marcellus, the new abbot, dated Feb. 14, not having been received when the writs were issued (Cal. Papal Letters, vii. 191). Of the temporal lords summoned to the previous parliament, all save Hugh Burnell, who was dead, received writs. The eight lords present at this parliament and not in the previous one had presumably come to England with Henry (Rept. Dign. Peer, iv. 846, 849).

⁷ Return Parl. i. 296 sqq.

⁸ Ibid.

in person when parliament was opened in the Painted Chamber on May 2, the day named in the writs, by the customary address from the chancellor. The speaker began by commending the king, especially for ascribing his victories to God, like Julius Caesar, who would hear nothing about his own exploits for fear of being puffed up. He also likened the king to Job, for as the patriarch gave thanks to God when he heard of the fate of his children, so Henry, when he was told of the death of Clarence and his comrades and the capture of many men of his company, praised God for the visitation of adversity. After enlarging on this theme, the bishop explained that the parliament had been summoned for the redress of wrongs and excesses committed in the realm during the king's absence, especially those to the detriment of men in his service overseas, for the maintenance of the laws and statutes, for the ease and safety of the people, and for the increase of the general weal, on which matters the king wished to have the advice of the "Estates and Commons¹." It was not a very instructive oration, and it is noteworthy that the chancellor seems to have said nothing about the treaty of Troyes, though the ratification of that agreement was by far the most important business that parliament had been summoned to transact.

The chancellor ended his speech with the customary order that the commons should choose a Speaker, who was to be presented to the king on May 6. They punctually elected Thomas Chaucer, one of the members for Oxfordshire, who was accepted by the king².

The ratification of the treaty of Troyes gave no trouble, though the previous parliament had been a little nervous about it³. The chancellor read the treaty before the "Three Estates⁴," and at the king's order they then scrutinised its terms. How long they spent on this we are not told, nor do we know whether the treaty was discussed. At all events, it was authorised and accepted by parliament, the members promising, on behalf of themselves and their heirs, to observe it for ever⁵.

For the rest, the proceedings of this parliament were not of

¹ "Les Estats et Communes," Rot. Parl. iv. 129.

² Ibid. 130; Return Parl. i. 297.

³ Rot. Parl. iv. 127.

⁴ Defined as the prelates and clergy, the nobles and magnates, and the commons (Rot. Parl. iv. 135).

⁵ Ibid.

great interest or importance. If the king's popularity was waning and the country becoming discontented, as a famous passage in Adam of Usk's chronicle¹ has led modern writers to suppose, there is no indication of such a revulsion of feeling in the official records². The king's authority appears to have stood very high. It was laid down, seemingly at Henry's instance, that such statutes and ordinances as might be made while he was away on his approaching expedition to France, should hold good only until the next parliament after his return³—a stipulation which was applied to some of the measures enacted in this parliament⁴. Parliament agreed, as we have seen, that the Council might use its discretion in granting security to those contributing to the loan that was just being raised⁵, and the king was empowered, all statutes and ordinances to the contrary notwithstanding, to remove the Staple from Calais to whatever place he chose for three years from the following Michaelmas⁶. Next to the ratification of the treaty of Troyes, the most notable measure was one concerning the currency, which, though not in so bad a plight as that of France, stood in need of improvement. At the instance of the government it was enacted that after Dec. 24 next all English gold coins should be valued by weight. Most of the gold coins in circulation being deficient in weight and quality, it was desirable to have them all recoined, and the king therefore surrendered the profits which he might lawfully claim on the recoinage of gold money which should be brought to the Tower mint before next Christmas⁷. Even so, it is evident that the measure threatened great loss to many.

The common petitions were few. There was the customary request, favourably answered as usual, for the enforcement of the Statutes of Labourers⁸. The commons still hoped that

¹ Usk, 133. There had been rumours of plots in Norfolk and Suffolk during the previous winter (Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., Jan. 21, 1421).

² It has been stated in modern works (e.g. Newhall, 150, n. 34) that the commons protested against the expense of the war. Newhall merely refers to Cobbett's "Parliamentary History" (i. 339), and I have been unable to trace the story further back than Speed's "Historie of Great Britaine." Speed (ed. 1632, p. 803) asserts that the petitions on the matter came from outsiders and were presented by them to the estates. There are, however, no such petitions in the printed rolls, though Speed refers to the records of parliament as authority for his story.

³ Rot. Parl. iv. 130.

⁴ Ibid. 131, 132.

⁵ Ibid. 130.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.; Statutes, ii. 208 sq.

⁸ Rot. Parl. iv. 146.

the alliance with Burgundy might be turned to their commercial advantage: they asked the king to negotiate with the duke and his Flemish subjects for the exclusion from Flanders of wool from Scotland and Spain, which was being worked there in increasing quantities, or, failing that, for the admission to Flanders of woollen goods manufactured in England; but the king merely replied that he would speak to the duke with the object of securing access for English cloth to the Flemish markets¹. The commons petitioned successfully that the justices of assize might resume their work (which, in the interests of the army in France, had been suspended since the king went abroad in 1417) though safeguards were provided for men serving overseas². An interesting petition represented that owing to pestilence and war there was a lack of suitable men for the offices of sheriff and escheator and asked that the statute limiting their term of office to one year might be abrogated. The king consented to suspend the statute for four years, with certain precautions³.

But if the influence of the commons in this parliament was relatively small, the records offer ample evidence of the important status they had acquired in public estimation. A great part of the roll is taken up by petitions presented in the first instance to the commons, and a great part of the time of parliament must have been devoted to their consideration. All sorts of people thought it wise to get the commons to commend their requests to the king and the lords. If Bishop Beaufort wanted parliamentary ratification of the letters patent securing his loans to the king⁴; if Lucy countess of Kent wanted protection against her late husband's creditors⁵, or Beatrice, widow of Thomas earl of Arundel, peaceable enjoyment of her dowry⁶; if Griffith Donne wanted dispensation from the laws forbidding Welshmen to purchase lands in England⁷; if the abbots and priors of England wanted exemption from the duty of collecting clerical tenths outside the district where they dwelt⁸; if the fishermen of the Thames wanted its waters to be better preserved⁹; if the earl of Salisbury wanted recognition as heir of

¹ Rot. Parl. iv. 146 sq.

² Ibid. 147; Statutes, ii. 205.

³ Rot. Parl. iv. 148; Statutes, ii. 206.

⁴ Rot. Parl. iv. 132.

⁶ Ibid. 130.

⁸ Ibid. 131.

⁵ Ibid. 143 sqq.

⁷ Ibid. 130 sq.

⁹ Ibid. 132.

his father's property¹; if the inhabitants of Oxfordshire, Berks, and Bucks wanted drastic action to be taken against violent and disorderly students from Oxford²; if the men of Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmorland wanted new measures for enforcing order and defending the Marches³; if the municipal authorities and merchants of Calais wanted the royal mint to be re-established there⁴; if the inhabitants of New Shoreham or Rottingdean wanted their assessment for tenths or fifteenths to be reduced⁵—would the commons ask the king to grant their requests or remedy their grievances in parliament⁶. There was, however, no fixed procedure for the presentation of petitions. The physicians and surgeons addressed one to the whole parliament⁷, the soldiers of the Calais garrison to the Speaker and the knights of the shires⁸, while there were still of course direct petitions to the king⁹, the great majority of which have doubtless perished.

It may perhaps be inferred from the records that the petitions addressed to the commons had four possible fates. They might adopt them and present them as "common petitions¹⁰." Or, without going so far, they might, as requested, commend the petition to the favourable consideration of the king or the lords. In that case, it was read in parliament and apparently considered there¹¹. The king's answer was given, sometimes "with the assent of the lords¹²," sometimes "with the assent of the lords and commons¹³," sometimes "by authority of parliament¹⁴," sometimes without allusion to parliament or any part of it¹⁵; and sometimes it was embodied in the statute of the year¹⁶. In the third place, it might happen that the commons were not prepared to countenance a petition. Then it might be sent on to the lords, if haply they might regard it more favourably¹⁷.

¹ Rot. Parl. iv. 141 sq.

² Ibid. 131.

³ Ibid. 143.

⁴ Ibid. 146.

⁵ Ibid. 159 sq.

⁶ In one or two cases the commons are asked to pray the lords to beg the king to ordain remedies (ibid. 143, § 22, 160, no. 8).

⁷ Ibid. 158.

⁸ Ibid. 159.

⁹ Ibid. 159, 162. Two petitions, addressed to the king, were given to the commons, who were asked to present them (ibid. 130, § 13, 141, § 21).

¹⁰ This seems to have been done with a petition from Calais (ibid. 146, § 27) and perhaps with No. VI (ibid. 147, § 29).

¹¹ Ibid. 131, § 14, 132, §§ 16, 17, 143, § 22, 144, § 23.

¹² Ibid. 132, § 17.

¹³ Ibid. 144, § 23.

¹⁴ Ibid. 131, §§ 14, 15; cf. 132, § 16.

¹⁵ Ibid. 143, § 22.

¹⁶ Statutes, ii. 208 (cap. 9), 206 sqq. (cap. 7).

¹⁷ Rot. Parl. iv. 159, 160 sq.

But the commons might reject it totally, though this seems to have been the fate of only one petition presented at the parliament under consideration, and that was not addressed to the commons as a whole but only to the Speaker and the knights¹.

Some of these petitions had results of public interest. Oxford students, it had been complained, frequently expelled from their property inhabitants of the adjacent country, poached in warrens and woods, and even rescued felonious clerks from the prisons of the ordinaries. They are, says the reply, to be proceeded against according to law, and if a student be outlawed for any of the offences specified in the petition, the chancellor of the university is to send him down². The qualified physicians and surgeons complained that "unconnyng an unapproved" practitioners are allowed a free hand, "to grete harme and slaughtre of many men," and asked that no one except university graduates in medicine be permitted to practise: it was ordained that the Council should be empowered to take action against physicians who had not graduated and surgeons who had not been admitted among the masters of their art³. Of more political significance were the extension to Redesdale of measures adopted in 1414 to suppress disorder in Tynedale and Hexhamshire⁴, and the recognition of the earl of Salisbury as heir of his father's possessions, a very timely acknowledgment of his services in France⁵. It was in this parliament, too, that a notable step was taken towards the settlement of the long-standing dispute about the division of the Bohun inheritance. In accordance with an agreement between her and the king, Anne countess of Stafford, Henry's cousin, had made a division of most of the lands in dispute, and in presence of the lords offered the choice to Henry, who selected one part, leaving the other to her. Henry's part, with consent of both lords and commons, was annexed to the duchy of Lancaster⁶.

On the whole this parliament, the last at which Henry was

¹ It is not certain that the petition in question was disregarded, but no answer to it is recorded (Rot. Parl. iv. 159, no. 5).

² *Ibid.* 131; Statutes, ii. 207 sq. In the previous year the university had been in trouble because students had forcibly liberated two prisoners of the archbishop from Oxford castle. At the instance of the royal Council the academic authorities had enacted new statutes for the preservation of good order, but these had evidently not been effectual (Snappe's Formulary, 187 sqq.).

³ Rot. Parl. iv. 130, 158.

⁴ *Ibid.* 143; Statutes, ii. 206 sq.

⁵ Rot. Parl. iv. 141 sq.

⁶ *Ibid.* 135 sqq.; G.E.C. (ed. Gibbs), vi. 473 sq.

present, was dull and unfruitful. The commons were small-minded and apathetic. There is no hint that anyone criticised the treaty of Troyes¹ or even asked a question as to the future relations of England and France, a matter which should have given parliament much concern. The members acquiesced in the levy of what was very nearly a forced loan, nay even encouraged it, though they must have known that it would of necessity be repaid from future taxes. There was evidently much disorder in the country, but the commons had no remonstrances or suggestions of their own to offer about it. The record of the parliaments which followed the treaty of Troyes compares badly indeed with that of the parliaments which followed the treaty of Brétigny.

The convocation of Canterbury met on May 5, its proceedings lasting till the 27th. On May 12 it voted a tenth to the king, half to be collected at the following Martinmas and the other half a year later. A first charge on the proceeds of the tax was to be the repayment of loans made by clergy². One of the transactions of convocation was to sentence a man to be flogged through Cheapside for having forged the seals of Archbishop Chichele and others³. Its attention, however, was principally concerned with the case of William Taylor, a reputed heretic, and the old question of the best way to secure ecclesiastical promotion for university graduates.

Taylor had been accused of Lollardy before, under both Arundel and Chichele. On May 24 he was produced before convocation in the chapter-house of St Paul's by the bishop of Worcester, who had long had him in custody for preaching doubtful doctrines at Bristol. On being questioned, Taylor denied that he had ever preached or held the opinions ascribed to him, though he admitted quoting two of them in writing. He then drew from his bosom a paper which was thought to contain arguments in favour of these views. He was forthwith removed and the paper taken from him. The opinions in question, with the contents of Taylor's paper, were referred

¹ The meeting of parliament is noticed by several chroniclers, but not one mentions the ratification of the treaty of Troyes.

² Conc. iii. 399; Fine Roll 9 Hen. V, m. 14. £1668 of the grant was forthwith assigned to contributors to the loan and entered in the Receipt Roll as received from the collectors (Rec. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 12, 1421). £483 was similarly treated a few weeks later (*ibid.* June 28, July 17, 1421). There could be no better illustration of the fact that the "receipts" of these rolls were by no means always received.

³ Conc., *loc. cit.*

to a committee consisting of the chancellors of the two universities and John Langdon, doctor of theology, a monk of Canterbury cathedral, who on May 26, Taylor being present, reported that the teachings attributed to him savoured of heresy and were not to be held by any Christian. Taylor concurred, but was nevertheless sentenced to imprisonment for life. Owing, however, to the condign penitence which he displayed, the archbishop, with the consent of convocation, announced that the bishop of Worcester might release him if he could find security acceptable to the royal Chancery that he would hold no heretical doctrines in future. He was taken away in custody of the bishop¹, but on June 2 John Sengleton, of Chart in Kent, gentleman, William Cokirnage, weaver, and John Aleyn, leather-seller, of London, and John Laurence, of Feltham in Middlesex, husbandman, went bail in £100 each that Taylor would appear before the king's Council if summoned and that he would no longer preach or teach error or heresy². Taylor was no doubt released, but in 1423 he was again before Chichele, and being convicted of relapse into heresy was degraded and handed over to the secular arm on March 1³. While recognising that we have only a summary record of the case, a record moreover drawn up by Taylor's enemies, one can hardly escape the conclusion that he was an unstable and disingenuous man, who was treated by the ecclesiastical authorities with as much consideration as he had any right to expect.

It was doubtless the continued enforcement of the Statute of Provisors with respect to lesser benefices that occasioned the complaint of the chancellors of the universities that these bodies were still suffering because of the difficulty experienced by graduates in securing preferment. On May 26 the subject was debated, and apparently some of the members of convocation seized the opportunity to criticise certain of the ordinances of the universities. Eventually it was agreed, with the king's approval, that if the universities would adopt certain modifications of their ordinances which the chancellors were prepared to recommend, a constitution designed to remedy their grievance should be put into force⁴. The chancellor of Oxford went home, but soon returned at the head of a deputation who brought letters ex-

¹ Conc. iii. 404 sq.

³ Conc. iii. 411 sqq.

² Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 22 d.

⁴ Ibid. 399.

pressing the consent of the masters to the proposed amendments, the most important of which permitted members of religious orders who had been through the full course in theology at the university, to incept in that faculty without taking the master's degree in arts. This concession had been sought by the friars, and represents a success for them in their continual conflict with the seculars¹. Evidently the changes passed were identical with those desired by convocation, for the archbishop published a constitution calling upon every ecclesiastical patron to bestow the next vacant benefice in his gift and thereafter every third such benefice, on a university graduate, an arrangement which was to last for ten years². The measure, though simpler in form, was very similar in purpose to the one issued on the same subject in 1417³.

Convocation had also given some consideration to abuses in the Church. It was decreed that no one taking orders was to be subject to any fees or charges on the occasion of the ceremony; the fee for institutions and inductions was fixed; and at the petition of some of the proctors of the lower clergy, a constitution of Archbishop Sudbury fixing the stipends of chaplains was read and it was resolved that it should be republished and thenceforth treated as binding⁴.

The capital was indeed the scene of much debate during May, 1421. For while parliament and convocation were sitting a great assembly of Benedictine monks was being held in Westminster abbey. It had been summoned by Henry, ever zealous in the cause of religion⁵. He had been told, it was reported, that Benedictine monasticism had gone far astray and could be restored to the right path by none but him, some

¹ Conc. iii. 399 sq.

² Ibid. 401. Bachelors were to be reckoned as graduates. We hear nothing of Cambridge, which presumably adopted the amendments also.

³ See above, p. 92.

⁴ Conc. iii. 399, 402 sq.

⁵ The summons to the abbot of Evesham is extant and worth quoting: "Trysti ant (*sic*) wel byloued in god, for certeyn matiers chargeable concernyng the worschipe of god as wel as the goode of youre ordre wyth his grace we wolle and charge yow streitly that ye do come to gedre not only the fadres bote also tho þat beon clerkes and oþere that beon notable persones yn euery hous of the same ordre yn as gret nombre as is goodly possible to assemble vnto oure abbeye of Westminster the v. day of may next comynge. Ant seþthe (*sic*) þat non suche as is byforesaid be excused fro the said congregacion wyth oute so resonable ant euident a cause þat by alle reson ogthe (*sic*) to be except, as yeo ant they bothe desiren to eschue oure indignacion. Yeuen under oure signet of the Egle yn the absence of oure oþer at oure town of Leycestre þe xxv day of marche" (MS. Cott. Titus C. ix. f. 18). The use of English in a summons to the heads of a religious order is no less remarkable than the preemprory language employed.

saying that this libel sprang from certain friars, others that its author was the prior of the Carthusian house of Mount Grace, formerly a Benedictine monk himself. Sixty abbots and conventual priors, with over 300 other monks, were present. The older monks were perturbed, though willing to admit that Henry had some ground for his concern, as the order had fallen under the guidance of young men¹. On May 7 the king joined the assembly as it sat in the chapter-house, and listened to an address by Edmund Lacy, bishop of Exeter. He himself next made a speech about the pristine rule of St Benedict, which had excited the devotion of his ancestors, and modern neglect of it. He then handed to the monks thirteen articles proposing reforms, and begged them to return to their primitive manner of life and to pray unceasingly for him, the realm, and the Church. Henry's attitude made a favourable impression on the assembly, but did not prevent a critical scrutiny of the document which embodied his suggestions². It began by asserting flatly that there were many abuses in Benedictine houses, and went on to propose reforms on such matters as the monastic habit, the periodical blood-letting (*minutio*), the possession of money by individuals, the use of private apartments, and intercourse with women. The articles indicate the prevalence of serious laxity and hint at worse. They are in no way original, but aim simply at the restoration of the genuine rule of St Benedict³. They were examined by a committee consisting of three nominees of the king—the bishop of Exeter, the critical prior of Mount Grace, and a secretary—and thirty representatives of the order, headed by the prior of Worcester⁴. The king's proposals underwent much criticism, and sub-committees drew up alternative schemes, but in the end a draft of the abbot of St Albans found widespread acceptance and after some amendment was adopted⁵. Its suggestions were very verbose

¹ Wals. ii. 337; Cont. Croyl. 513 sq. Wilkins mistakenly calls the assembly a provincial chapter, and misplaces it under 1422 (Conc. iii. 413). Cf. Pantin, 217, 221, who points out that the presence of so many abbots and priors is striking evidence of the importance which the monks attached to the occasion.

² Wals. ii. 337 sq.; Conc. iii. 413 sq.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Cont. Croyl. 514; cf. Wals. ii. 337.

⁵ Cont. Croyl. 514; Wals. ii. 338; MS. Cott. Titus C. ix. f. 18. The document is printed by Wilkins (Conc. iii. 414 sq.). There has been much confusion over its date. In the MSS. from which it was taken by Wilkins it was probably ascribed to 1420—"Henrici quinti anno octavo" (MS. Cott. Vitellius E. xii. f. 92; Reyner, App., pt. 3, p. 170), Wilkins altering the "octavo" to "decimo." But Walsingham and the Continuator of the Croyland Chronicle leave no doubt that the abbot of St Albans' recom-

and obviously an attempt to evade compliance with Henry's proposals. When they were more than pious wishes, they were robbed of their force by qualifications and exceptions¹. And even these innocuous proposals seem never to have been confirmed by any authority with power to legislate for the English Benedictines. Nevertheless, Henry contented himself with them², but the only fruit of his efforts is apparently to be seen in four constitutions passed by the provincial chapter held at Northampton in July, 1423, when he had been dead for nearly a year. One of these constitutions deals with the duties of abbots; the other three have to do with dress³.

Henry's amazing energy and industry were never more strikingly illustrated than during this visit of his to England. For, besides all the domestic business already noticed, the defence of the realm had caused some anxiety, and dealings with foreign powers claimed much of his attention. The dauphinists were active and sanguine and perhaps hoped to keep Henry in England by threats of invasion. At all events it was deemed advisable in March to send to sea a powerful squadron of balingers and barges under William Bardolph, who had under him a good-sized force of men-at-arms and archers⁴. About the middle of the month it was reported that a large Castilian fleet was about to make a descent on the Isle of Wight, the inhabitants of which were ordered to hold themselves in readiness and promised reinforcements and munitions in case of need⁵. The danger, if it ever existed, seems to have passed over, perhaps because of the activities of Bardolph. There remained, however, the difficulty of maintaining the defence of the northern frontier, which was particularly irksome just then. Though of late years the balance of military success had inclined

mendations were adopted at the assembly of 1421, a view confirmed by a close examination of the two Cotton MSS. cited above. The document in Conc. iii. 417 sq. is evidently a report of one of the sub-committees (cf. Cont. Croyl. 514).

¹ Conc. iii. 414 sq.

² Cont. Croyl. 514.

³ Conc. iii. 426. Cf. Walsingham, ii. 338. He disdains to describe the reforms, which apparently had not been accepted by the provincial chapter when he wrote. It may be noted that if the articles approved at Westminster in 1421 had been given legal effect, the constitutions passed at Northampton would have been superfluous.

⁴ Rym. x. 68. Bardolph had at least ten balingers and three barges. Five of the balingers belonged to the king, among these being the *Nicholas de Toure* and the *Ave de Toure*, each with a crew of one hundred (Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., March 11 and 19, 1421). The mariners were impressed for six weeks, the troops were serving for forty days (*ibid.*).

⁵ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 362.

towards the English, the border counties were in a sad plight. Pestilence had supplemented the ravages of war; many inhabitants had fled to more favoured regions; great tracts of land had gone out of cultivation; while the trade of the ports was being injured by Scottish raiders at sea, and the burden of maintaining the fortifications of castles and towns was proving too heavy for those responsible¹. It was high time too that something was done to check the flow of Scottish troops to the dauphinist regions of France—a consideration that gained new weight after the battle of Baugé. Henry was in a strong position for negotiation with the Scots, for not only was their king his prisoner, but he could now use the name and authority of the king of France. It is consequently not surprising to find that he was soon followed to England by Gilles lord of Clamecy and three other envoys of Charles VI, charged with a mission to Scotland concerning the advantage of all three realms. In March they were escorted north by John Colville². It was probably with the object of promoting these negotiations that Henry took James I with him to the north. The representations of the Frenchmen seem soon to have borne fruit. Scotsmen met Henry at York³, and though we do not know for certain why they were there, it is significant that on April 11 safe-conducts were issued in favour of the earls of Douglas and Athol, who were coming to England⁴. In the middle of May Douglas was evidently at Westminster⁵, and on May 30 he signed an indenture in which, stating that King James had come to an agreement with Henry about his release and had ordered him (the earl) to aid the English king, he promised to do so with 200 knights and esquires and 200 mounted archers, who were to be ready at Easter next⁶. Next day Henry announced that, through the mediation of the earl of Douglas, it had been agreed that if, within three months of Henry's return from his expedition to France, James should deliver as hostages a number of Scottish lords and bishops, who are named, he might then return to his country⁷. It was generally believed that Henry made it a condition of the prospective release that James

¹ Rot. Parl. iv. 143; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 343.

² Ibid. p. 321; Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., March 11, 1421; Devon, 365.

³ Rot. Scot. ii. 228.

⁴ Rym. x. 99 sq. The earl of Athol does not seem to have used his safe-conduct.

⁵ Rot. Scot. ii. 229.

⁶ Rym. x. 123 sq. It is to be noted that the earl's promises were given to Henry personally.

⁷ Ibid. 124.

should marry Joan Beaufort¹, but it was rather Henry's permission than James's consent that was needed for such a match. The agreement postponed James's release to an undetermined date; nor, as it seems, did it technically involve a peace or even truce between the two realms. Its practical effect, however, was no doubt to establish what passed for peace on the Border², and, what was still more important to Henry, recruiting for the dauphinists in Scotland appears to have been checked³. Indeed, several Scotsmen evidently engaged to serve Henry with substantial retinues⁴, though it is not certain that these undertakings were actually carried out.

Henry's diplomacy met with other successes about the same time. On March 17 a treaty was signed at Rouen with the duke of Bourbon, who, helped by the good offices of the duke of Savoy, had long been trying to regain his freedom. He promised to swear to the treaty of Troyes and to make his subjects do the same. He was to furnish seven hostages, including his younger son; to deliver to Henry till Nov. 1, 1422, six notable places in his lands, the expense of their upkeep and defence being borne by himself; and to pay a ransom of 100,000 crowns. Sixty thousand of these were to be paid by Aug. 8 next, and if this condition were fulfilled he would be released⁵. The duke tried hard to fulfil the agreement, selling land, borrowing money, and organising warlike operations against recalcitrant vassals⁶, and on April 10 he received the chancellor of Normandy's quittance for 25,000 gold crowns, 3000 of which were represented by jewels⁷. The dauphin not only granted him 100,000 *l. t.* out of his own revenues, but also sought, though in vain, to induce Lyons to make a contribution towards the ransom. Beaucourt thinks that the dauphin cannot have known of the duke's "treachery" in accepting the treaty of Troyes; but his grant was not made until May 19⁸, and it must have been impossible to keep the terms

¹ Monstr. iv. 26.

² Kingsford, *Lit.* 290; Monstr. iv. 26.

³ It had been expected in dauphinist circles that early in May the earls of Douglas and Mar would cross to France with six or seven thousand men. But the troops never came (Beaucourt, i. 336).

⁴ This seems the explanation of the strangely-worded safe-conducts issued by Henry at Dover on June 9 in favour of Alexander Seton, lord of Gordon, Alexander and Fergus Kennedy, Alexander Forbes, and John St Clare (*Rym.* x. 127, 128).

⁵ *Ibid.* 85 sqq.; Huillard-Bréholles, *Rançon*, 47.

⁶ *Ibid.* 48 sq.; *Rym.* x. 70 sq.

⁷ Huillard-Bréholles, *Rançon*, 48.

⁸ Beaucourt, i. 373.

of the agreement secret for two months. Probably the dauphin expected that once Bourbon was at large, his acceptance of the treaty would not count for much; but, whatever the duke's intentions, he failed to satisfy the conditions of his release, for the 35,000 crowns needed to bring the total paid to 60,000, were not handed over till the following November. No more was paid during Henry's lifetime¹. As it was impossible for Henry to occupy any places in the duke's lands, neither party gained much by the agreement, though Henry might boast that, besides 60,000 crowns, he had secured from one of the greatest men of the Armagnac faction a formal recognition that the treaty of Troyes was "good, reasonable, and just²."

Another achievement, equally striking in appearance and equally fruitless in the event, was the conclusion of a new treaty between England and Genoa. Two Genoese agents were commissioned on Feb. 7 to treat for an alliance with England, the settlement of all existing claims, and a trade agreement³. Their arrival must have been delayed, and it was not till May 1 that the bishop of Worcester, John Stafford, keeper of the privy seal, and William Alnwick were appointed to negotiate with them⁴. The treaty was dated May 29: injuries were to be mutually forgiven, except that the Genoese were to pay £6000 compensation to one William Walderne and his fellows for merchandise which some of their citizens had evidently seized; neither party should be bound to engage in the wars of the other, nor should either aid the enemies of the other unless already in alliance with them; subjects of each party should have access, under the usual conditions, to the territory of the other⁵. Though the treaty was not formally ratified by Henry until the autumn, an official safe-conduct to all Genoese entering or leaving England was issued on June 9⁶.

It was a time when international politics were extremely complicated and the relations of states very unstable. When the negotiations with Genoa were in progress an envoy from

¹ Huillard-Bréholles, *Rançon*, 50 sq., who, without any grounds, charges Henry with bad faith towards the duke.

² *Rym.* x. 85.

³ *Ibid.* 118 sq. In 1420 the negotiations with the Genoese, abortive in 1419, had been resumed; but again they bore no fruit (*ibid.* ix. 86, x. 16; *Cal. Pat.* 1416-22, p. 276).

⁴ *Rym.* x. 66, 93, 117.

⁵ *Ibid.* 120 sqq.

⁶ *Ibid.* 128.

Alfonso V of Aragon was in England¹. Now, Castile being obdurate in its friendship for the dauphin, it was obviously to Henry's interest to cultivate an *entente* with Alfonso, who was at the time trying to secure the kingdom of Naples in opposition to the duke of Anjou and was therefore disposed to look with favour on the Anglo-Burgundian cause. But Aragon was at enmity with Genoa, which was supporting the Italian ambitions of Anjou, and in the treaty between Henry and the Genoese, Aragon is expressly mentioned as one of the enemies of the latter². Henry had to choose between the two. Unwisely, as the sequel proved, he preferred Genoa. But, reluctant to reject Alfonso's overtures altogether, he despatched an embassy to express his sense of the king of Aragon's friendly disposition; to suggest that he might appoint representatives to discuss with Henry the terms of an alliance; and to ask if in the meantime he would abstain from helping Henry's enemies³. The meaning of this was transparent, and it is no wonder that Alfonso let the matter drop.

About the same time two ambassadors from Portugal, officially an ally of England, were in the country, but the purpose of their errand is not known⁴.

Far more vital, however, than the establishment of friendship with the states of southern Europe was the maintenance of Henry's good relations with the dukes of Brittany and Burgundy, and it happened that during his stay in England his position in regard to both changed for the worse. In the case of Brittany the fault was not Henry's. When he left France the truce with Brittany still held good, though violations of it by the Bretons seem to have been exceptionally numerous and serious, and in February envoys had to be sent to urge on the duke the enforcement of its terms and to seek reparations⁵. Apparently they produced some effect, for it was arranged that commissioners from both sides should meet at Pontorson on April 20 to discuss the maintenance of the truce, arrange for the punishment of breaches of it, and hear the complaints of those who had suffered by them⁶. But the battle of Baugé wrought a change in the duke's feelings. Never enthusiastic for the English, he now came to the conclusion that they were

¹ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Easter, June 5, 1421.

² Rym. x. 120.

³ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 285.

⁴ Rym. x. 121, 134.

⁵ Ibid. x. 61 sqq.; Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 8, 1421; Exch. Accts. 321/38.

⁶ Rym. x. 91 sq.

going to lose, and on May 8, after conversations with the dauphin at Sablé, signed a treaty in which, promising to aid Charles with all his resources against the English and their allies, he renounced all his treaties with Henry, while the dauphin undertook to help him against his enemies, especially Olivier and Charles de Blois, to execute justice upon them for their recent outrage on him, and (in a secret clause) to remove from his own court the president of Provence and three others supposed to have had a hand in it¹. In accordance with the treaty, the duke's younger brother, Richard count of Étampes, brought a considerable force to the dauphin's army and took part in the ensuing campaign². Nevertheless, the duke was careful not to break completely with England³. While he was negotiating with the dauphin at Sablé, Breton envoys, headed by the bishop of Nantes, were visiting Henry, who was at pains to treat them courteously and liberally⁴. On May 21 English commissioners were named to discuss alleged breaches of the truce with commissioners of the duke⁵, and friendly relations between him and Henry seem never to have been publicly severed. Still, the treaty of Sablé added greatly to Henry's anxieties and to the difficulty of the military situation.

Henry's relations with the Burgundians were not altogether happy in the autumn of 1420, but outwardly he and the duke had remained on good terms. Their friendship, however, was soon subjected to a severe strain by Henry's attitude towards Jacqueline of Hainault, whose fateful arrival in England occurred just after Henry had left London for the west. There is no need to recount in detail the events which led up to Jacqueline's flight from the Netherlands; but to appreciate its significance one must remember that her second marriage, to the wretched duke of Brabant, had been arranged in the interests of Burgundian policy, that her quarrel with her husband had caused much annoyance to both Duke John and Duke Philip⁶, and that just before she fled from Hainault to England Philip believed that he had persuaded her to go back to her

¹ Morice, *Preuves*, ii. 1091 sq.; *Beaucourt*, i. 224 sq.; *Cabinet Historique*, iv. 175; *Bibl. nat.*, MS. franç. 26,044, nos. 5670-2.

² *Beaucourt*, i. 456 (letter of Jean Caille to the inhabitants of Lyons); *Morice, Histoire*, i. 487, *Preuves*, ii. 1086, 1088, 1089.

³ The list of presents in *Morice, Preuves*, ii. 1163, 1164, is amusing evidence of the duke's resolve to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds.

⁴ He gave the bishop 500 marks and contributed towards the expenses of the other envoys (*Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch.*, May 2, 1421; *Rym.* x. 116, 117).

⁵ *Ibid.* 115.

⁶ *Monstr.* iv. 26; *Le Fèvre*, ii. 30 sq.; *Chast.* i. 210 sq.

husband at Brussels¹. For Henry to harbour Jacqueline and to encourage her efforts to obtain the dissolution of her marriage could not but give grave offence to the duke, and, to make things worse, it was generally believed, probably with truth, that Henry had known of her intention and had helped her to carry it out². In 1427 Jacqueline, when trying to induce the English government to maintain her cause, repeatedly asserted that she had come to England at Henry's instance and in reliance on promises he had made, and that he had pledged his support in her divorce suit and arranged her marriage with Gloucester³—statements which no one seems to have contradicted, though it was to the interest of Henry VI's Council to do so. The story that her escape was planned at Valenciennes by Lewis Robsart, a Hainaulter by birth and one of Henry's most trusty servants⁴, receives colour from the fact that about the time of her flight Robsart was sent by Henry with messages to the duke of Burgundy⁵. Moreover, when she left Valenciennes, she gave out that she was going to Ponthieu, of which she was dowager countess⁶. Now on March 1, over a week before she crossed to England, Henry issued a request to his allies and a command to his subjects to assist Jacqueline and her mother on their projected journey to Ponthieu⁷. The direct route from Valenciennes to Ponthieu passed through no English territory and the "allies" with whom the two travellers would come in contact would all be subjects of the duke of Burgundy. It looks then as if Henry were expecting Jacqueline to arrive at Calais and had made up his mind to risk offending Duke Philip; the mention of Ponthieu in the safe-conduct would save his face if she were stopped by Burgundian officers and might prevent the duke from suspecting her real destination until she had crossed the Channel. At all events, she left

¹ Le Fèvre, ii. 31.

² *Ibid.*; Löher, Beiträge, i. 44.

³ *Ibid.* ii. 220, 222 sq., 224, 227, 228 sq., 233.

⁴ Le Fèvre, ii. 31 sq.; cf. Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 27. Monstrelet (iv. 27) and Chastelain (i. 212) call Jacqueline's confidant and protector the seigneur d'Escaillon. So does the Cordeliers chronicle (292), which says that he had come to Valenciennes from Henry to see his wife. Robsart had letters of denization on March 8, 1417 (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 27), and on May 25, 1420, had been appointed Henry's standard-bearer (Rot. Norm. 8 Hen. V, p. 2, m. 26).

⁵ Under date of March 19, 1421, the Issue Roll (8 Hen. V, Mich.) records payment of £66. 13s. 4d. to Lewis Robsart, sent by the king to declare certain things to the duke of Burgundy, for his wages and passage. There is no indication whether Robsart had got back or was about to go; but it is a singular coincidence that under the very same date Jacqueline first appears in the Issue Rolls, £100 being paid for her expenses at Calais and on the way to London.

⁶ Le Fèvre, ii. 32.

⁷ Rym. x. 67 sq.

Valenciennes on March 6, Bouchain next day, and reached Calais on the 8th¹. After waiting at Calais until messengers whom she had sent to Henry returned with assurances of welcome, she was met at Dover by many lords, one of whom was the duke of Gloucester, and immediately escorted to London². Henry must have been away, a fact which perhaps helped him when he made explanations to the duke of Burgundy, envoys from whom were in London in April³. From the first Jacqueline was treated as an honoured guest. Her expenses at Calais and on her journey thence were paid by the Exchequer⁴, and she lived at the king's charges after her arrival in London⁵. On July 8 the Council decided that as from July 10 she should receive a fixed sum of £100 monthly for the expenses of her household⁶ and this was paid to her for the rest of the reign⁷. On July 9, the keeper of the wardrobe was ordered to deliver to her forty beds and couches for the nobles and others serving her⁸. It looks as if the Council had become convinced that her sojourn in England would be a long one, but there seems to be no evidence as to what advantage Henry expected to draw from it. Perhaps he thought that she might be useful in case the duke of Burgundy became recalcitrant, and it is noteworthy that in the treaty with Genoa she figures in the list of Henry's allies⁹. But while it is true that Henry could not foresee the depths of folly into which she was to tempt his brother Humphrey, it cannot be denied that his conduct in the affair hardly became an ally of the duke of Burgundy and that it was foolish to risk a breach of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance for the problematical benefits which might be gained through Jacqueline's dependence upon him.

¹ Löher, Jakobäa, i. 406; Cordeliers, 292.

² Monstr. iv. 27; Chast. i. 216 sq. That she stayed some time at Calais is suggested by Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., March 19, 1421, and 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 2, 1421.

³ Ibid. April 23, May 2, 1421.

⁴ Ibid. 8 Hen. V, Mich., March 19, 1421, 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 2, 1421.

⁵ Ibid. April 23, May 2, May 9, June 18, 1421. Her expenses were included in the Treasurer's estimates of May 6 (Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 312; see above, p. 274).

⁶ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 291; Rym. x. 134. The money was to be drawn from the issues of the lands of Queen Joan (Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., July 5, 1421).

⁷ Iss. Roll 9 and 10 Hen. V, *passim*.

⁸ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 293.

⁹ Rym. x. 121. She is described there as Jacoba, duchess of Bavaria, countess of Holland and Zealand. By the English she was usually styled "duchess of Holland," even in official documents (see e.g. Rym. x. 134; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 291; Iss. Roll 8 Hen. V, Mich., March 19, 1421). In June, 1422, her mother was paid 2000 marks by Henry; the reason does not appear (Devon, 373; Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., July 1, 1422).

CHAPTER LXIX

BAUGÉ

WHEN Henry left France, the military situation, though it gave no ground for immediate concern, was not really satisfactory. The dauphinists were strategically in a strong position. They held almost undisputed a solid block of France beyond the Loire, whence they could strike, with the advantage of interior lines, at the territory under the control of the English and the Burgundians. This was much less compact and much harder to defend. It is true that Henry had a fairly firm hold on Normandy and the country between it and Paris, and that Duke Philip could count on the obedience of his own fiefs. Not only, however, was the duke's effective strength much impaired by the gap between his lands in the Netherlands and the two Burgundies, but it was difficult to protect the communications between each of these regions and the country conquered by Henry. For though north-east France was generally Burgundian in sentiment, the dauphinists still held some important positions there. The operations of Henry in the previous summer and autumn had cleared the line of the Seine and the Yonne, and so, as it seemed, secured communications between Paris and Dijon: but the dauphinists were still strong in Champagne, where the famous La Hire was very active¹ and the equally renowned Pierron de Luppé held the castle of Montaigu near Rheims², while they were also in occupation of Meaux³, Compiègne⁴, Guise⁵, and several neighbouring strongholds of less strategic value⁶, whence they could impede intercourse between Paris and the Netherlands, besides inflicting much damage on the adjacent country. Some of the dauphinist captains in these outposts of their cause were able and resolute men. While Henry was at Paris, for instance, a force of English from eastern Normandy, joining the Burgundian garrison of Creil, raided Brie and Valois, taking

¹ St Denys, vi. 458; Juv. 565.

³ Juv. 561.

⁵ Ibid. 35.

² Rym. x. 33.

⁴ Monstr. iv. 20.

⁶ Ibid. 97.

many prisoners and much booty; but on their way back they were caught at Montepilloy¹ by the lord of Gamaches, at the head of troops from Compiègne and places near by, and put to flight with severe loss².

In the operations of the winter of 1421, the aim of the dauphinists was to sever the English from the Burgundians by cutting the river communications between Paris and Dijon and by conquering the Somme valley. As long as they refused to fight a battle in strength, it was clearly the right strategy for the English and the Burgundians, while of course repelling dauphinist attacks, to root out the hostile garrisons in the north-east. Unfortunately, Henry, eager to go to England, jestingly refused the requests of the Parisians that he should reduce Meaux³; the duke of Burgundy remained supine for some months; and the duke of Clarence turned his thoughts to another quarter.

Early in 1421 the dauphinists gained two notable successes. In January Buchan and Wigtown returned from a recruiting visit to Scotland with large reinforcements⁴. On Jan. 25, the dauphin held a council of his leading supporters at Selles, where they discussed how the English might best be resisted and Charles VI delivered from Burgundian domination. It was resolved to summon the States-General of Languedoil to Clermont for May 1, and meanwhile to prosecute the war with vigour⁵. Already, indeed, an important enterprise was on foot, and on Jan. 28 the lord of Chaumont-Quitry and the viscount of Narbonne captured Villeneuve-sur-Yonne, and wrote to the dauphin begging for reinforcements which would enable them to take Joigny, a few miles up the river⁶. The stroke cut off Paris from a valuable source of supplies, and added greatly to the sufferings which the citizens were undergoing⁷. At Sens, a short distance down stream, there was a Burgundian garrison under the lord of L'Isle Adam and there were several other places in the neighbourhood held by Burgundian troops. The duke gave

¹ A few miles east of Senlis.

² Monstr. iv. 20.

³ Juv. 561.

⁴ Ibid. 564; Beaucourt, i. 333 n., 335.

⁵ J. Chartier (Vallet de Viriville), iii. 314 sq.; Beaucourt, i. 219, 359.

⁶ Ibid. 454 sq. The date is wrongly given by all the chroniclers who mention the event, Monstrelet, who puts it in February (iv. 35), being nearest the truth. The place is called Villeneuve-le-Roi by contemporary writers, but the letter printed by Beaucourt and the account in *Trahisons de France* (cited below) leave no doubt that the town now called Villeneuve-sur-Yonne is meant.

⁷ Monstr. iv. 35; Cordeliers, 290.

orders that these forces should combine to recapture Villeneuve in the spring, but L'Isle Adam, apparently with none but his own men, attacked the place during February. He seems to have been too weak to push the siege with vigour, and his troops suffered much from hunger, the dauphinists intercepting a convoy of bread on its way from Joigny. Presently he learned that a relief force under Narbonne was near at hand. He had been obliged to send his horses away for lack of fodder; so, fearing to encounter Narbonne, he was fain to bury his artillery and retreat on foot. Next morning the viscount arrived, and, finding no besiegers to fight, immediately made for Joigny; but he, too, had soon to retire, since he could get nothing for his horses to eat in the snow-covered country. L'Isle Adam shortly afterwards betook himself, with many of his men, to the neighbourhood of Troyes¹. Apart from a fruitless attempt on his part to bribe the captain of Villeneuve², the Burgundians seem henceforth to have left the place alone; but the Parisians managed to make an agreement with the captain, whereby he allowed food to pass down the Yonne to Paris on payment of a duty³.

The loss of Villeneuve, serious though it was, mattered less to the Anglo-Burgundian cause than events which were happening in Picardy. There Louis Bournel, captain of Gamaches, had turned dauphinist immediately after the publication of the treaty of Troyes⁴, and Henry's departure for England was the signal for a number of other lords in the region to follow his example⁵. Of these by far the most important was Jacques d'Harcourt, count of Tancarville in right of his wife, lord of Montgommery, cousin of the count of Aumale⁶. He had been identified all his life with the Burgundian cause, having been brought up with Duke John: but his dislike of the treaty of Troyes was intensified by anger at Henry's detention of his wife's lands of the county of Tancarville. Some time during 1420 he withdrew to Le Crotoy⁷, where he had been entrusted by both dukes, John and Philip,

¹ *Trahisons*, 161 sqq., a somewhat incoherent but a full and vivid account; cf. *Monstr.* iv. 35.

² *Trahisons*, 164.

³ *Monstr.* iv. 35; *Cordeliers*, 290.

⁴ *Fenin*, App. 295. It was widely believed in the neighbourhood that the treaty of Troyes handed Ponthieu over to the rule of either Duke Philip or Henry, and Abbeville sent deputies to Paris and other places to protest against it (*A. Ledieu*, *Ville d'Abbeville: Inv. somm. des archives municip.* p. 9).

⁵ *Fenin*, 152.

⁶ *La Roque*, *Hist. de la Maison d'Harcourt*, i. 610 sqq.

⁷ He was still on the Burgundian side in December, 1419, when he sold a cannon to the duke for the siege of Roze (*La Picardie*, iii. 146).

with the custody of the castle. He fortified the town and for a while preserved an ambiguous attitude. Early in 1421, however, he began to show his changed sentiments. Fitting out a ship, he seized in the harbour of Étapes a vessel belonging to a local lord of Burgundian sympathies, and refused to obey the duke's order to surrender it. At the appeal of the victim, the lieutenant of Calais, William Bardolph¹, attacked the harbour of Le Crotoy, and burned the shipping there; but Harcourt raided his enemy's estates, and called to his aid a number of lords of Ponthieu who were openly or covertly dauphinist. Not a few joined him; he soon got possession of St Valéry-sur-Somme and many strong places in Vimeu and the Somme valley; he made war on the English by sea and land, capturing many ships and much property; and he even surprised and took the town of Eu in Normandy, though he was soon driven out. He now began to receive help by sea, and he was, of course, a serious menace to communication between England and France as well as between Paris and the Netherlands². Intercourse between these two had to be conducted along a narrow corridor through Amiens, and even this was in danger of being cut by a junction between Harcourt's men and the dauphinists about Compiègne.

As an offset to the gains of their enemies the Burgundians could point to nothing better than the capture of Château Thierry³, while the English had wasted their strength in a futile raid which Clarence, at the request (it is said) of the people of Chartres, led through Beauce to the borders of the forest of Orléans. He afterwards withdrew to Normandy⁴. From the military point of view, the dauphinist cause was certainly in the ascendant when the approach of spring rendered possible the more ambitious movements which resulted in the battle of Baugé.

It is generally very difficult to discover what happened in a mediæval battle; indeed, where it took place is often a matter of doubt and controversy. And among battles Baugé is assuredly one of the most perplexing. In the first place, the evidence about it is exceptionally heterogeneous. As a rule,

¹ Gilliodts van Severen, Cotton Manuscrit, pp. 407, 409; Rot. Norm. 8 Hen. V, p. 2, m. 18 d; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., April 1, 1421.

² Cordeliers, 294; Monstr. iv. 21; Fenin, 152.

³ Monstr. iv. 35. The date is not clear, but the capture apparently took place about February, 1421.

⁴ Cousinot, 179. I have found no other mention of this raid, which must have been quite a small one.

reports of a battle fall naturally into two well-marked groups, those from the victors and those from the vanquished; and, if we may judge from the experience of the Great War, the victors' version is likely to be the nearer to the truth. But at Baugé there were soldiers of two nations in the victorious army, and the impression left by the Scottish accounts¹ of the battle differs greatly from that left by those of the French dauphinists². We have, besides, not only English versions³ but several reports by Burgundian writers⁴. One is tempted to place great reliance on the last, for their accounts are clear and consistent. Some of them, too, were familiar with military affairs⁵ and they had less temptation than dauphinist French, Scots, or English to distort the facts⁶. But the value of the Burgundian sources is gravely impaired by the fact that no Burgundians were engaged in the battle, and the writers must have obtained their information through the medium of people with strong national prejudices. It is even possible that they reflect the official story put about by the English to allay apprehension

¹ To be found in the Liber Pluscardensis and Bower's Continuation of the Scotichronicon. To this group of authorities also belongs the letter purporting to come from the Scottish leaders (see below, p. 307, n. 3).

² Of these the most notable are Gilles le Bouvier, *alias* the Herald Berry (very valuable), Cagny, Cousinot, Jean Juvénel des Ursins, and the Religieux de St Denis, whose bias at this stage of his chronicle seems to me dauphinist, an impression I had gained before the publication of M. Ch. Samaran's articles arguing that the last sixteen chapters of the *Chronique du Religieux* were really written by Jean Chartier (*La Chronique inédite de Jean Chartier, 1422-1450, et les derniers livres du Religieux de St Denis*, in *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, lxxxvii. pp. 142 sqq., and *La chronique Latin de Jean Chartier*, in *Annuaire-Bulletin de la Soc. de l'Hist. de France*, 1926, pp. 184 sqq.). Bourdigné's *Chroniques d'Anjou et de Maine*, though not written till a hundred years later, contains some useful information, based partly, it seems, on local tradition, partly on a dauphinist source which had evidently been known also to the Herald Berry.

³ The most valuable are Walsingham's, written soon after the event, Hardyng's, which contains some unique information about the beginning of the battle (probably obtained from a retainer of the Umfravilles), and that in the *Vita Henrici*, which is the fullest. The recently discovered work of Peter Basset, Christopher Hanson, and Luke Nantron (*Coll. of Arms*, MS. M. 9, ff. xxxi sqq.; E.H.R. xli. 510 sqq.; *Paston Lett.* [ed. 1904], iv. 235) has an independent account which is closely followed by Halle (105 sq.). It seems to me, however, improbable that Halle used the compilation in the College of Arms MS. as an authority for the reign of Henry V, for which, I think, he and the authors of the College of Arms chronicle had a common source—perhaps Basset's *Acta Regis Henrici V* (E.H.R. xli. 504). Halle's reference to a John Basset (p. viii) I take to be merely a slip.

⁴ The best is Le Fèvre, who has many details peculiar to himself. The Cordeliers chronicle adds a few particulars. Monstrelet has little that is not to be found in either of these. Chastellain's account is evidently based in part on information of dauphinist origin.

⁵ Notably Le Fèvre, who had been at Agincourt, but also Monstrelet and Chastellain.

⁶ Le Fèvre is sympathetic towards the English, Chastellain strongly biassed against them; but their accounts are more impartial than those of the English, Scottish, or dauphinist writers who go into detail.

among their allies¹. On the whole, then, the Burgundian narratives must be handled with caution; their very clearness and reasonableness betray the natural tendency of the judicious narrator to simplify and harmonise the facts which he has gleaned; and to get near to the vivid impressions of the actual participants in the fight, one must look in other quarters.

The weighing of the evidence relating to the battle is complicated by the singular course which events took. The English were undoubtedly defeated, and consequently were more likely than their opponents to distort the facts. But their misfortunes all occurred in a short spell of hand-to-hand fighting; in the sequel English generalship and morale appeared at their best, and the French saw many of the fruits of victory slip from their grasp². One may expect, therefore, to find that numerous important facts were suppressed on both sides, that the French and Scottish accounts are the better for the main conflict, and that for what followed more credence should be attached to the statements of the English.

On every phase of the battle, however, French, Scots, and English have something of importance to tell us, and the principal mistake of modern writers has been to follow authorities of one nation only, ignoring or summarily rejecting the rest³. It must be remembered that the battle began unexpectedly. Neither side occupied a position deliberately chosen beforehand. There was little opportunity for displaying tactical skill. The actual fighting was almost entirely hand-to-hand. In all probability the combatants seldom had a very clear notion of where they were; they saw the enemy and fought him. Under such conditions it is not surprising if the reports of those who took part in the fight are contradictory. No one

¹ A comparison of the account of the "Bourgeois" (151 sq.) with those of Le Fèvre and Monstrelet seems to me to give some ground for this suspicion. He certainly owes nothing to them, nor they to him; nor do they elsewhere show traces of having used a common source: but there are several remarkable features common and peculiar to their descriptions of the battle.

² These broad facts appear in authorities of every class.

³ Mr C. L. Kingsford (*Henry V*, 347 sq.) relies almost wholly on English writers, though he cites Monstrelet and Chastellain. He ignores the dauphinist and Scottish chroniclers and so is led to speak of the battle as "a skirmish," which is no doubt how contemporary Englishmen wished to regard it. The authorities he employs, however, are handled with great acumen, and he brings out clearly the essential features of the situation before and after the fight. On the other hand, Mr R. B. Mowat's account (256 sq.), which is based almost exclusively on Jean Juvéⁿal des Ursins, does not even reveal the fact that Clarence attacked the French from the south. As an authority for the battle, indeed, Jean Juvéⁿal ranks low among the dauphinist writers.

could give a general impression of the course of the action, for no one had one. Each man simply told what had happened to him personally, and so the vivid stories in the *Liber Pluscardensis*, the chronicle of the Herald Berry, Hardyng's chronicle, and the *Vita Henrici*, though differing widely from one another, may yet describe accurately what was seen and experienced by the eye-witnesses from whom in all likelihood they were directly derived¹.

Circumstances conspired to make a pitched battle more likely in March, 1421, than it had been since Agincourt. Henry had always wanted one, but his narrow escape in 1415 had evidently taught him caution, and he would never expose his army to the risk of being taken at a disadvantage. But Clarence had shared neither the glory nor the experience of Agincourt, and he was consequently ready to face much greater hazards in order to provoke a fight. The dauphinists, too, were in a confident mood, heartened by their recent successes, the arrival of Scottish reinforcements, and the absence of Henry, whom, reasonably or not, they feared more than any other English commander. Further, the Scottish leaders were evidently in high favour with the dauphin²; they had not inherited the Fabian tradition of the days of Charles V, and were no doubt eager to demonstrate the injustice of the sneers which the French were directing against them as wine-bibbers and mutton-guzzlers³. So it came about that early in March each side had a considerable army assembled. Clarence's force, formed largely from the garrisons of Normandy and numbering probably some 4000 men, mustered at Bernay⁴. Where the dauphinist army assembled is not certain⁵, but their enemies believed that they were in Anjou⁶, though a few days before the battle they were evidently near Tours⁷. The force consisted almost entirely

¹ In composing the narrative which follows I have tried to guide myself by the considerations just noticed. I am aware that nearly every statement in it might be challenged with the support of a contemporary authority. That disadvantage, however, would attend any attempt to write a full account of the operations which culminated in the battle of Baugé.

² Beaucourt, i. 220, 335.

³ "Devoratores vini et multonum nebulones," Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1209 sq.; "muttonum commestores et vini consumptores et haustores," Pluscard. i. 353 sq.

⁴ Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, f. xlii; Halle, 105. On the numbers of the force, see below, p. 304, n. 3.

⁵ Probably near Poitiers (Cousinot, 182 n.; J. Chartier [Vallet de Viriville], iii. 316; Beaucourt, i. 220).

⁶ Monstr. iv. 37; Chast. i. 223.

⁷ Letter of the dauphin to the inhabitants of Tours, March 20, Luzarche, 35 sq.; also in Beaucourt, i. 455.

of Scots, under Buchan and Wigtown, but there were also a number of French nobles and knights, headed by the lord of La Fayette, one of the dauphin's marshals¹. Clarence moved first. He advanced rapidly southward through Maine, crossing the Huisne at Pont-de-Gennes² and the Loir at Luché³. He passed through Baugé⁴, and then, having received the surrender of many towns and strongholds on his march⁵, he came before Angers and made preparations to besiege it. But the place was stronger than he expected, the garrison refused to give battle, and, having knighted a number of his followers, among them his bastard son⁶, he withdrew to Beaufort-en-Vallée, which he made his headquarters while his troops plundered the surrounding country⁷.

Meanwhile the dauphinists had advanced from the east towards Clarence's line of communications. On Good Friday, March 21, they were at Le Lude on the Loir⁸. On the same day they pushed forward to Baugé⁹, having been strengthened by a force of Angevins who had been collected by the lord of Fontaines but had found the English too strong to attack¹⁰. The combined force was stationed at Vieil Baugé¹¹. It was thus on Clarence's line of retreat to Normandy.

The dauphinist leaders had selected La Lande Chasles, a village about six miles south-east of Baugé, as the place where they would offer battle. They had not, however, intended to

¹ Cagny, 119; Juv. 564; Cousinot, 180; Chast. i. 223, 227; Monstr. iv. 38; Pluscard. i. 355; A. Lecoy de la Marche, *Le Roi René*, i. 39, n. 1.

² Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, f. xlii; Halle, 105; Pont-de-Gennes is in dep. Sarthe, arr. Le Mans, cant. Montfort.

³ Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, f. xlii; Halle, 105; Luché is in dep. Sarthe, arr. La Flèche, cant. Le Lude.

⁴ Juv. 564; Lib. Pluscard. i. 355.

⁵ Vita, 301 sq.; Wals. ii. 338 sq.; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 65.

⁶ Bouvier, 440; Bourdigné, ii. 141; Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, f. xlii; Halle, 105.

⁷ Bouvier, 440; Cagny, 119; Cousinot, 180; Bourdigné, ii. 141; Wals. ii. 338.

⁸ Pluscard. i. 355; Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1214.

⁹ Ibid; Letter of Scottish earls in Beaucourt, i. 220.

¹⁰ Bourdigné, ii. 141.

¹¹ Ibid. Vieil Baugé is a village about a mile south-west of the town of Baugé, and, like it, on the right bank of the Couasnon. It had been an important place until the eleventh century, when count Fulk the Black had built a castle on the hill protected by the streams of the Couasnon and Altrée. This castle became known as Baugé, and gave its name to the town which grew up round it. The new town soon eclipsed the old one, which in the fifteenth century had already sunk to the rank of a village (*Revue de l'Anjou*, i. 276 sqq., ii. 71 sqq.; C. Port, *Dictionnaire Historique, géographique et biographique de Maine-et-Loire*, i. 223 sqq.). But the town was still "Petit Baugé" and the village "Grand Baugé" (Bouvier, 440); and even in the sixteenth century the town was sometimes distinguished as "Jeune Baugé" (Bourdigné, ii. 142).

fight till Easter Monday¹; indeed, it was afterwards pretended on both sides that an understanding as to the time and place of the battle had been reached². Clarence, for his part, was unaware of the proximity of the enemy force until he was at dinner on the Saturday, when his foragers brought in some Scots whom they had captured³. Clarence questioned them in English and they revealed the presence of their comrades and the French at Baugé. The duke immediately rose from table, saying, "Let us go against them, they are ours." Except for the archers of his bodyguard, he would take with him only men-at-arms⁴, perhaps, as some said, that he might give the lie to the taunt that the English victories were due entirely to their bowmen, but more probably because it would have taken time to collect a substantial force of archers, most of whom were foraging⁵, and he feared lest the enemy might retreat before he could engage them. With him went the earls of Somerset and Huntingdon, the former's brother Edmund Beaufort, John Grey count of Tancarville, and Lords Roos and Fitzwalter⁶. Luckily, as events proved, the earl of Salisbury was left behind, with orders to collect the rest of the army and follow as soon as possible⁷. Clarence and his party rode as fast as they could⁸, though Huntingdon remonstrated in vain against the rashness of what they were doing⁹. Near Baugé

¹ Letter of earls, Beaucourt, i. 220. According to Scotichron. (iv. 1214), the Scottish leaders only learned at Le Lude that Clarence had left Baugé and that he was at Beaufort.

² This belief is expressed in both English (Brut, ii. 427; Kingsford, Lit. 320), French (Juv. 564), and Scottish (Pluscard. i. 355) writers. Jean Juvénal and the author of the Lib. Pluscard. accuse Clarence of having treacherously broken the agreement; but no other writers bring such a charge, and the course of events shows that no negotiations can have taken place.

³ Bouvier, 440; Bourdigné, ii. 142; Wals. ii. 338.

⁴ Bouvier, 441; Bourdigné, ii. 142; Cagny, 120; Pluscard. i. 355; Vita, 302; Brut, ii. 492, 563; Latin Brut (Kingsford, Lit.), 319, 320.

⁵ Vita, 302; Wals. ii. 339.

⁶ Vita, 303; Wals. ii. 339; Hardyng, 334; Brut, ii. 427, 448, 463, 492; Chast. i. 225sq.; Juv. 565; Bouvier, 441; Cousinot, 180. The story that Clarence was the victim of the treachery of a Lombard, which until lately rested solely on the authority of Halle (106) and Strecche (278 b)—the latter's version being quite absurd—has been made respectable by the discovery of the work of Basset, Hanson, and Nantron (Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, ff. xlii b, xliii; cf. E.H.R. xli. 510), where it appears. It cannot, however, be true; for had the English really been enticed to their doom by a lying Italian, every English and Burgundian writer would eagerly have seized at the excuse. As it is, some of them hint at treachery on the part of the enemy commanders (Bourgeois, 151; Brut, ii. 427; Kingsford, Lit. 320).

⁷ Wals. ii. 339.

⁸ Vita, 302; Hardyng, 334; Bourdigné, ii. 142, "et bien luy sembloit n'y estre jamais a heure."

⁹ Vita, 302.

Gilbert Umfraville, with five men-at-arms, came up, and begged Clarence to turn back and keep Easter before offering battle. "If thou be afeard, go home thy way and keep the churchyard," replied the duke, adding that Umfraville had won great glory with the king, while he (Clarence) had gained none. Umfraville urged that Clarence's company was not strong enough to give battle and that the rest of the army knew too little of his intentions to furnish effective support. Nevertheless he would not desert his leader, and they rode on "aye chiding by the way¹." Meanwhile Clarence's advancing force had been descried by La Fayette, whom Buchan had sent out with a party to inspect the ground at La Lande Chasles where they intended to fight on the Monday². Hastening back, they gave the alarm, the English following hard at their heels³. It was now late in the afternoon⁴, and the Scots and French were scattered, some resting, some amusing themselves⁵. Clarence made for the bridge over the Couason near the castle of Baugé, the approach to which was swampy⁶. On the far side were some of the Scots at their sports or their prayers. Hardly had the alarm been given when the English banners could be seen coming through the woods towards the bridge. Shouting for help, the Scots snatched up what weapons they had⁷; thirty men sent by Buchan under Robert Stewart of Railstone appeared at the critical moment, and a hundred more, belonging to the retinue of Walter Kennedy, rushed down from an adjacent church, where they had been quartered⁸. The horses of the English refused to face the storm of arrows which came from the Scots; Clarence and

¹ Hardyng, 334 sq. I have modernised Hardyng's spelling.

² Letter of the Scottish earls, Beaucourt, i. 220; *Scotchchron.* (Hearne), iv. 1214.

³ *Ibid.* 1214 sq.; Pluscard. i. 354.

⁴ Godefroy, *Annotations*, 732; Pluscard. i. 355; *Wals.* ii. 339; *Latin Brut* (*Kingsford, Lit.*), 320.

⁵ Pluscard. i. 354 (a very vivid and convincing account); *Scotchchron.* (Hearne), iv. 1415; *Juv.* 564; *Cagny*, 119.

⁶ It has long been known as the Pont des Fées, and is some distance to the east of the modern bridge over which the main road from Saumur now enters the town (*Port*, i. 223, 226, 228; *C. Fraysse, Le Folk-Lore du Baugeois*, 31). The bridge is mentioned by Hardyng (335), *Scotchchron.* (iv. 1215), and the "Bourgeois" (151), though the last carries little weight on such a matter. Other writers speak merely of a difficult crossing of a river (*Vita*, 302; *Le Fèvre*, ii. 35; *Monstr.* iv. 38; *Chast.* i. 224). *Walsingham* (ii. 339) refers to the swamp, and the statement that Clarence crossed the river near the castle, a detail of great value, is in *Vita*, 302.

⁷ Pluscard. i. 354.

⁸ *Scotchchron.* (Hearne), iv. 1215; Pluscard. i. 355; *Juv.* 564. This may have been the parish church of St Leonard, which then stood close to the site of the present hospital; the chapel of St Sulpice on the banks of the Altrée; or the chapel of St Michel, which was on the slope above the bridge—probably the last (*Port*, i. 224, 226, 227, 228).

his men had to dismount; and it was only with great difficulty that they at length forced their way over the bridge and across the Altrée, a small stream which joins the Couason a few hundred yards farther west¹. They now found themselves faced by a small band of Frenchmen under Jean de la Croix, who were on their way to join the lord of Fontaines. Fleeing to the parish church, they took their horses inside, barricaded the doors, and flung stones from the tower on the English. These soon realised that they were wasting time, and made off towards Vieil Baugé². In the western outskirts of Baugé the ground rises a little, but beyond the town it falls into a shallow depression, approximately semicircular in shape, with the Couason as its chord. Across this depression, at a distance of two or three hundred yards from the stream, runs the road to Vieil Baugé. Clarence, wearing over his helmet a golden coronet glittering with jewels, rode at the head of his men, and the English evidently encountered no resistance until they had advanced some way up the slope which bounds the low ground on the west. Then, however, there appeared on the skyline close at hand a strong enemy force, which Buchan, who was leading them, had hastily mustered and got into some sort of order³. Both sides charged⁴, and there followed a desperate hand-to-hand conflict which raged in and around the grave-

¹ Pluscard. i. 355 sq.; Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1215; Wals. ii. 339.

² Bouvier, 441; Bourdigné, ii. 142. This incident is probably reflected in the statement by the author of the *Vita Henrici* (302) that immediately after crossing the stream, the English put to flight a party of the enemy's horsemen. That the building where these took refuge was the parish church is almost certain for topographical reasons.

³ Bouvier, 441; Bourdigné, ii. 143; Vita, 303; Le Fèvre, ii. 35; Monstr. iv. 38; Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1215.

⁴ The authorities cited in the last note, with the report of the Scottish commanders (Beaucourt, i. 220), seem to warrant this conclusion. Mr Mowat (257) says, "the French fought on foot, with the Scottish archers distributed among the men-at-arms." If this were true, it would, of course, mean that the customary rôles of the French and the English were reversed, and that the battle was, so to speak, an inverted Agincourt. Mr Mowat apparently relies on Jean Juvénal des Ursins, who says, "Quand les Francois et Escossois virent l'ordonnance et manière de leurs ennemis, ils ne firent que comme une bataille a pied" (564 sq.). But Juvénal's account of the battle is vague and confused, and the assertion just quoted is not confirmed by any authority, though such conduct as is ascribed to the French and Scots could hardly have escaped comment from one or other of the experienced soldiers who wrote about the battle. There would indeed be better ground for contending that the English fought on foot, as is stated by Hardying (335) and implied by Bower (Scotichron. [Hearne], iv. 1215), though there can be no doubt that, having made good their passage of the bridge and swamp, Clarence and his followers remounted, for they would certainly not have tried to walk more than a mile in their armour. The Scots on the river bank were, of course, on foot, and no doubt others who could not reach their horses in time lent aid to their more fortunate comrades as occasion offered (Pluscard. i. 354; St Denys, vi. 456, "alternatim strenue preliatum est, partim equester, partim vero pedester"—a suggestion that there were men fighting on

yard of Vieil Baugé¹. Both sides were constantly reinforced, for the French and Scots had not all assembled when the fight began, and many of the English had not been able to keep up with the leaders². Throughout, the English were greatly outnumbered; the French and Scots had at least 5000 men engaged; while from start to finish not more than 1500 Englishmen can have taken part in the fighting³, and the late-comers, straggling into action after their long ride and the difficult passage of the stream, were at a fatal

foot on both sides). It was unquestionably a disorderly battle, and neither party had time to organise its line scientifically. Chastellain, however, whose account is largely independent of any other extant source, assumes throughout that the main conflict was fought on horseback (i. 224 sq.), suggesting that Clarence may have been trampled to death by the horses' hoofs and attributing the defeat of the English in part to their inferiority in equestrian fighting. The author of the *Vita Henrici* appears to be thinking throughout of mounted men (302 sq.); a Scottish description of the fight and pursuit seems to take it for granted that those concerned were horsemen (Pluscard. i. 355); and local legend busied itself with the feats of Clarence's horse after its master's death (*infra*, p. 306, n. 5).

¹ "Le samedi xiii^e (sic) jour de mars, voile des granz Pasques, l'an de grace mil cccc xx, ou cymetière du vieil Baugé, environ iiii heures apres disner, fut faicte la desconfiture du duc de Clarence . . ." A. Lecoy de la Marche, *Le Roi René*, i. 39, n. 1, quoting from "les mémoriaux de la Chambre des comptes d'Angers" in "Arch. nat. P 1334³, f. 39." The same document is printed by Godefroy, *Annotations*, 732, who corrects the date and describes it as "extraict d'un vieil Registre de la Chambre des Comptes, estant en la Chambre d'Anjou, fol. 142." Cagny states that the fight was near the church of Vieil Baugé (120); Cousinet (180) and Bourdigné (ii. 143) place it in that village; Bouvier (441) says it was in or near Grand Baugé, which evidently means the same place. Confirmed as it is by local tradition, this evidence leaves no doubt that the main conflict occurred on the crest and eastern and southern slopes of the low hill across the shoulder of which the road from Baugé approaches the village, and a few hundred yards to the north-east of Vieil Baugé church (*vide infra*, p. 306, n. 5). The situation of the modern monument seems to be more accurate than its inscription.

² Pluscard. i. 356; Cagny, 119; Monstr. iv. 38; *Le Fèvre*, ii. 35; Fenin, 153 sq.; Chast. i. 226.

³ It is impossible to say for certain how many men were engaged on each side. As usual, the total numbers of the two armies are very variously estimated. The French and Scots are given 5000-6000 combatants by Jean Juvénal (564), 6000 by Bower (*Scotichron.* iv. 1214), and 7000 by the *Liber Pluscardensis* (i. 355). Clarence's strength at the outset of his expedition is put at 6000-7000 by Jean Juvénal (564), 10,000 by Pluscard. (i. 355), and 10,000-12,000 by Cagny (119). Chastellain (i. 223) thinks that the two armies were about equal in numbers. Raoulet (*J. Chartier*, iii. 169) estimates the dauphinist force at 1000, which is certainly too low, but he does not ascribe more than 4000 to the English. Perhaps this is not far from the mark. It would in fact have been practically impossible for Clarence to have taken with him a force much bigger than this (*cf. supra*, pp. 240 sq.).

At Baugé the whole of Buchan's force seems to have been at hand, though many doubtless took little or no part in the fighting. The record cited by Lecoy de la Marche and Godefroy (*supra*, n. 1) states that the English had 1500 men-at-arms. Jean Juvénal (564) says that 1000-1200 English nobles were present, while hinting at indefinite numbers of archers. He adds afterwards that Salisbury's force at Beaufort amounted to 4000 (565). There seems no doubt that in the battle the English were much inferior in numbers. One would expect the *Vita Henrici* (303) to emphasise this, but *Le Fèvre* (ii. 35) says that the dauphinists were twice as many as the English, and Fenin (154) that they were "sans comparaison plus que les Engles."

disadvantage¹. The losses of the English were terrible². Their enemies recognised that they fought with great fierceness and courage, but they were, in a word, overwhelmed³. Clarence was one of the first to fall, both French and Scots claiming for one of their countrymen the distinction of having slain him⁴. The count of Tancarville, Lord Roos, and the prudent and loyal

¹ Clarence and his companions evidently approached Baugé from the south, since they were descried by a party which had gone out towards La Lande Chasles. But the shortest route from Beaufort to Baugé passes quite near to Vieil Baugé, which can be seen across the Couason about a mile before the bridge is reached. It is likely, therefore, that many of the English saw the battle in progress while they were yet some distance from Baugé, crossed the stream as best they could, clambered up the steep slope, and plunged haphazard into the fray. This surmise receives support from Chastellain (i. 225 sq.), and would account for the omission of any mention of a bridge by all the English authorities save Hardyng.

² No one denies this. Strange to say, the Burgundian writers have the highest estimates of the English casualties, Monstrelet's being 2000-3000 killed and 200 prisoners (iv. 38), and Chastellain's 3000 killed and 500 prisoners (i. 226 sq.). Of the English authorities Halle (106) puts the dead at almost 2000, while suggesting that the prisoners were not numerous. These are manifest exaggerations. Among writers of the victorious party Cagny (121) puts the English losses at 1500 killed, Cousinot (180) at 1054 killed and 600 prisoners, Bower (Scotchichron. iv. 1216) at 1617 killed. Bourdigné (ii. 143) says that all the English were either killed or captured, which is probably near the truth. It will be noticed how the dauphinist estimates of the losses of the English confirm the view that they had some 1500 men engaged.

³ Cagny, 120; Juv. 565; Le Fèvre, ii. 35; Chast. i. 225 sq.; Vita, 303.

⁴ Bouvier (441) says that Clarence was the first to fall, and Bourdigné (ii. 143) states that he was killed in single combat between the two armies by the lord of Fontaines, a story which savours too much of the days of the Chevalier Bayard. Chastellain, in a picturesque passage, says that the duke fought with wonderful valour, doing great deeds with his sword after his lance was broken. Charles le Bouteiller, however, ran him through the stomach, the blade entering under a plate with a broken hinge. Clarence fell, but whether he was already dead or was trampled to death by the horses Chastellain did not know (i. 225). Bouteiller was immediately afterwards slain by Lord Roos (ibid. i. 226) while trying, according to Cousinot, to save Clarence, in the hope of exchanging him for the duke of Orléans (180). Bower (Scotchichron. iv. 1215) declares that the duke was wounded in the face by William de Swinton and then struck to the ground by Buchan; and by April 18 a report had reached Ferrara that Clarence had been killed by "monsieur de Ventona," a name which is possibly a distortion of Swinton (Morosini, ii. 198 sq.). Bower's hero, however, was called not William, but John Swinton, of that ilk. He was Buchan's nephew. At the beginning of the nineteenth century his family still cherished the head of the lance with which he was believed to have unhorsed the duke (Douglas, Baronage, 129; Exch. Rolls of Scotland, iv. pp. clxxxvi, 226, 279; Forbes-Leith, 17). On the other hand, the author of the *Liber Pluscardensis* discreetly remarks that in the mêlée it was impossible to say who killed whom, but that common report had it that the duke's slayer was a Lennox highlander, Alexander Makcaustelayn by name, the ground for this belief being the fact that after the battle he was in possession of the duke's coronet, which he sold to John Stewart of Darnley for 1000 nobles (i. 356). But a few hours after the battle Buchan and Wigtown had no reason to think that the slayer of Clarence was a Scot, or they would assuredly have commended him to the dauphin in their report. In short, Clarence died by an unknown hand, and there may be truth in Walsingham's assertion (ii. 339) that the victors did not know of his death until the bodies of the slain were searched after the fight.

Gilbert Umfraville were also among the dead¹: the earls of Huntingdon and Somerset, Edmund Beaufort, and Lord Fitzwalter were taken prisoners². Those who survived scattered in various directions. Some carried the bad news to Beaufort³; some fled north, hotly pursued until the fall of darkness enabled them to elude their enemies in the woods⁴. The losses on the other side were relatively small, and of their notable men only Charles le Bouteiller and the lord of Fontaines seem to have perished, and hardly one Scot of distinction⁵.

There remained Salisbury's force, consisting mainly of archers, with their retreat to Normandy cut off. Some of the English and Burgundian writers give the impression that they came up shortly after the disaster to Clarence's men, that the French withdrew before them after slight resistance, that they rescued Clarence's body, and remained masters of the field—in short that the honours of the day and the claim to victory lay with the English⁶. This version of the sequel to Clarence's misfortune will not, however, hold water. It is in the first place

¹ Vita, 303; Wals. ii. 339; Hardyng, 335; Kingsford, Lit. 289, 319; Halle, 106; Monstr. iv. 38; Le Fèvre, ii. 35; Fenin, 154; Chast. i. 226; Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1216; Pluscard. i. 356; Bouvier, 441; Bourdigné, ii. 143; St Denys, vi. 456; Juv. 565; Beaucourt, i. 220. Umfraville was commonly called the earl of Kyme, which French writers frequently made into Kent; cf. e.g. Monstr. iv. 38. Even the Scottish earls make it "Quint," Beaucourt, i. 220. On this title, see G.E.C. (ed. Gibbs), i. 151.

² For the prisoners, see Vita, 303; Wals. ii. 339; Hardyng, 335; Brut, ii. 427, 447, 492; Kingsford, Lit. 289, 295, 319; Chron. 73, 127; Monstr. iv. 38; Fenin, 154; Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1216; Pluscard. i. 356; St Denys, vi. 456; Bouvier, 441; Cousinot, 180; Juv. 565; Bourdigné, ii. 143; Beaucourt, i. 220.

³ Bouvier, 441; Bourdigné, ii. 143.

⁴ Pluscard. i. 355, 356; Cagny, 121. Cf. Wals. ii. 339.

⁵ Chastellain (i. 226) and Monstrelet (iv. 39) put the losses of the victors at 1000–1200 killed, a manifestly excessive figure. On the other hand, Jean Juvénal (565) gives them as twenty-five or thirty killed; the Liber Pluscardensis (i. 356) as eighteen killed; and Bower as twelve Scots and two Frenchmen (Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1216). Bouteiller's death is mentioned in the letter of the Scottish earls (Beaucourt, i. 221). For the death of Bouteiller, see also Lecoy de la Marche, i. 39 n.; Pluscard. i. 356; Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1216; Cousinot, 180; Chast. i. 227; Monstr. iv. 39. For the lord of Fontaines, see Lecoy de la Marche, loc. cit.; Monstr. iv. 39.

The battle made a great impression on the local mind, and legends about it are still current. The church of Vieil Baugé has a twisted spire, and the story goes that Clarence's horse, fleeing from the fight, made a great leap and knocked the spire sideways. The horse figures in other tales, and its hoof-print may be seen to this day on more than one stone in the neighbourhood, including the big slab set up as a monument of the battle. Another tradition tells how the wheel of a mill on the Couason turned round three times with the blood that flowed down from the battle-field; and it is said that Clarence's men had been miraculously warned that they would all perish between two parishes bearing the same name (C. Fraysse, *Le Folk-Lore du Baugeois*, 17 sqq.). These legends are not without value as evidence that Clarence was on horseback, and that the main action took place not far from the church of Vieil Baugé, and on ground which sloped sharply away to the stream.

⁶ Vita, 303; Wals. ii. 339; Hardyng, 335; Brut, ii. 427, 492; Monstr. iv. 38; Le Fèvre, ii. 36.

most unlikely that the victorious army, holding a strong position, should have withdrawn when threatened with attack by such a force as Salisbury's. Again, an army with the moral ascendancy attributed to Salisbury's does not immediately execute a long and fatiguing retreat after discomfiting its enemies, nor is it so anxious to get away as to resort to discreditable subterfuges¹. Apart from such considerations, one has to remember that darkness was falling when the battle ended², and that Salisbury was not the man to lead his troops by night over unfamiliar country into the close neighbourhood of a superior army, still less to set them searching for corpses in the dark. There is, moreover, reason to believe that Buchan and Wigtown were in Baugé at midnight, when they wrote their despatch to the dauphin³. Dauphinist sources, further, have an account of the doings of the English force which differs greatly from what is told by English and Burgundian writers, and from a collation of the two versions it is possible, as it seems to me, to form a good idea of what actually happened.

When the French and Scots ceased pursuing the remnants of Clarence's force, they returned to their quarters in and

¹ See below, pp. 308 sq.

² *Scotichron.* (Hearne), iv. 1216; Walsingham (ii. 339) admits that the English losses would have been much greater had not darkness stopped the conflict.

³ The document used to be in the archives of Albi, but the present archivist informs me that it has been missing for more than forty years. It was printed by Compayré in *Études historiques sur l'Albigeois* (266) and by Beaucourt (i. 220 sq.). There would be no reason to doubt its authenticity were it not that it is signed "les contes de Douglas et de," the second name having been torn off. Beaucourt supplies the word "Boucan"—a conjecture which may be correct, though if so it is strange that the name of the commander-in-chief should follow that of a subordinate. It is, however, the other name that raises a really serious difficulty. For the earl of Douglas was in Scotland (see above, p. 286), where about this time he must have been listening to overtures from Henry. Buchan's associate, Archibald Douglas, son of the earl, was earl of Wigtown, as he is correctly styled in the record from the *Chambre des Comptes* of Angers cited by Lecoy de la Marche and Godefroy (above, p. 304, n. 1), and by several dauphinist writers ("Comte de Vviction," Bouvier, 440; "le conte de Vigton," Cousinot, 180; "le conte de Victon," Cagny, 118 sq.; "comte de Victon," Juv. 564; "comes de Victon," St Denys, vi. 454). We may well believe that he was often spoken of as earl of Douglas, for among the Scots, even in official records, titles were very loosely used at this time (cf. *Exch. Rolls of Scotland*, ii. p. clxxxii), but when so many French writers get his title right, it is singular that he could not do so himself. The letter, however, can hardly be a forgery, and it may be conjectured that the names were written by the scribe, who was perhaps a local notary, ignorant of the correct style, title, and order of precedence of these foreign lords.

The letter was written "en ceste dicte ville de Baugé," by which *Jeune Baugé* was almost certainly meant. It gives no details of the battle and significantly omits all allusion to Salisbury's force.

around the two Baugés¹. They naturally hoped to intercept the English troops under Salisbury, and it seemed likely that they would do so without difficulty. There was no need to risk an attack on the archers at Beaufort; Salisbury would be obliged to retreat towards Normandy; he would have to clear the Franco-Scottish force out of his way, with probable disaster to himself, or, if he tried to elude them, he would expose himself for hours to an assault from the flank. But the intelligence service of the victors was woefully at fault. Salisbury set out with his men at dawn on Easter Sunday. Instead of trying to retreat by the route which Clarence had followed on his southward march, he made straight for La Flèche, a course which took him some miles westward of Baugé through country which is well-wooded now and doubtless was so then. The French and Scots completely lost touch with him. They assumed that if he did not appear at Baugé, he would cross the Loir in the neighbourhood of Le Lude, and apparently moved troops in that direction². Meanwhile, a party of English, perhaps detached to cover Salisbury's right flank, appeared on the battlefield of the day before. There they found most of the dead lying where they had fallen³, but Clarence's body was just being taken away in a cart⁴. Headed by the duke's bastard son John⁵, the English attacked such of the enemy as were on the spot, rescued the body and some others⁶, and then made off. Even after this the leaders of the Franco-Scottish army seem not to have grasped the situation. Salisbury's men made their way to the Loir near La Flèche. On their march they had carried

¹ Letter of earls (Beaucourt, i. 221); Juv. 565; St Denys, vi. 456.

² Bouvier, 441; Juv. 565.

³ Hardyng, 335; Vita, 303; Halle, 106; Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, f. xlv.

⁴ Brut, ii. 492; Wals. ii. 339.

⁵ John, Bastard of Clarence, described as a king's knight, received revenues and lands in Ireland from Henry VI in 1428 and 1429 as a reward for his services (Rym. x. 406, 427 sq.). In Dec. 1429 he was about to sail for France with 49 men-at-arms and 700 archers (Cal. Pat. 1429-36, pp. 41 sq.). On July 3, 1431, he was appointed constable of Dublin castle (*ibid.* 122).

⁶ Rym. x. 406; Brut, ii. 427; Kingsford, Lit. 295; Hardyng, 335; Halle, 106; Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, f. xlv; Monstr. iv. 39; Vita, 303. That the rescue of the duke's body took place on the morning after the battle seems probable when the circumstances are considered and the accounts of the various authorities compared. Halle and the College of Arms chronicle say that Clarence's son had been left behind at Beaufort and that he was still there when he heard of the beginning of the fight. He consequently could not have reached Baugé till long after dark, and everything points to his having been there during the English retreat next day. The College of Arms chronicle adds that the rescuers buried the dead, with the exception of Clarence and other lords; this, if true at all, can refer only to the corpses of some of the more notable victims. That the Bastard was so successful was probably due to the fact that most of the enemy troops were on the east side of Baugé looking out for the English there.

off from the villages as many doors as they could conveniently remove, and laying these on carts they made a bridge on which they quickly crossed the river. Thence they hastened across southern Maine to Le Mans. When they approached the town, they found that the bridge over the Sarthe had been broken; but the English advance guard, putting white crosses on their coats, persuaded the people of Le Mans that they were French and induced them to mend it. The English, on entering the town, are said to have slain a hundred of the inhabitants, why we are not told¹. It was not until Salisbury's force was across the Loir that the victors of Baugé discovered its whereabouts. Then they rode straight to Le Mans, but found that the English had broken down the bridge behind them and had passed through the town. They therefore gave up the pursuit, and left Salisbury to make his way to Normandy².

The battle of Baugé was a momentous event, and some of its consequences will be described and discussed below. But to the student of military tactics and strategy it offers little of interest. Salisbury's retreat was obviously conducted with very great skill, and could only have been accomplished with troops of high quality; but we have no detailed knowledge of his dispositions during the march. As for the battle itself, it was little more than a disorderly scuffle. Except when actually giving and receiving blows, Clarence cuts an amazingly poor figure. His folly in rushing off from Beaufort with a small force against an enemy of uncertain strength was perhaps no worse than Henry's when he set out from Harfleur on the march which led to Agincourt: but before that battle Henry at least took whatever tactical measures he could to ensure success, whereas on reaching Baugé, Clarence rushed at the enemy like a bull, and, if we have interpreted the authorities correctly, let his force, small as it was, come into action piecemeal. His suicidal perversity, however, was well matched by the stupidity and sluggishness of the Scottish and French leaders after their victory. If they had caught Salisbury, Henry's chances of enforcing the treaty of Troyes would have been ruined, and the verdict of Castillon would very likely have been anticipated by thirty years. But, with all the cards in their hands, they threw away the game, and suffered the escape of the most able soldier in France..

¹ Bouvier, 441; Juv. 565; the slaughter at Le Mans is mentioned by the Bourgeois, 152.

² Bouvier, 441; Juv. 565.

Tidings of the battle reached the dauphin at Poitiers on Easter Monday¹. The first report declared that the Scots had fled and that the victory had been due to the French. This caused surprise, according to a Scottish writer²; but Charles at once went to church, where a special Mass was sung and a sermon preached in honour of the good news³. The real facts must soon have become known, and, to set all doubts at rest, the Scottish lords presented themselves at Tours a few days later with their prisoners, the French having none. Charles sharply rebuked those who had spoken against the Scots⁴.

Authoritative news of the battle did not reach Paris till Friday, April 4. Processions were at once organised to pray for the safety and prosperity of the realm and the city. A week later the *Grand Conseil* enjoined all members of the *Parlement* to observe the terms of the treaty of Troyes and to report all who should say or do anything against it⁵. Letters in Charles VI's name were sent to the principal towns with the object of reassuring the inhabitants, who were told that Henry and Duke Philip would soon return⁶. On receiving the news the duke of Burgundy went into mourning again and had a service for Clarence's soul very ceremoniously sung in the church of St Vaast at Arras⁷. The battle caused an immense sensation and the wildest rumours were about. At Bruges, for instance, it was reported that Charles VI was dead, and that the dauphin had entered Paris after inflicting on the English a great defeat in which Clarence was killed; and a speedy agreement between the two realms was expected in consequence⁸. In Italy, too, the seriousness of the English defeat was much exaggerated; it was believed in some quarters that Henry himself had been killed⁹; and the most important developments were anticipated¹⁰. At Rome the news was said to have drawn from Pope Martin V the famous *mot*, "Verily the Scots are the antidote of the English¹¹."

¹ Bouvier, 441; Juv. 565.

² Pluscard. i. 357.

³ Juv. 565.

⁴ Pluscard. i. 357; cf. Cousinot, 181.

⁵ Fauquembergue, ii. 14 sq.

⁶ Beaucourt, i. 223; Doyen, Hist. de la ville de Beauvais, i. 61. The government had other grounds for concern, for Guillaume lord of Châtillon, captain of Rheims, had lately been taken prisoner by the dauphinists, and on April 7 a letter had to be written to the citizens, exhorting them to remain loyal, promising speedy succour, and informing them incidentally, in a very casual tone, of the battle of Baugé (*Le Moyen Age*, Sér. II., xxi. 13 sqq.; cf. *Le Cabinet Historique*, i. 59 sq.).

⁷ Cordeliers, 294.

⁸ Morosini, ii. 202 sqq.

⁹ *Ibid.* 202, n. 4.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 198 sqq.

¹¹ "Vere Scoti Anglorum tiriaca sunt," *Scotchron.* (Hearne), iv. 1216.

CHAPTER LXX

THE ANGLO-BURGUNDIAN RECOVERY

AMONG the dauphinists, as in more remote quarters, high expectations were aroused by the battle of Baugé. In their letter written just after the fight, the Scottish earls had begged the dauphin to join them and invade Normandy at once, "for, with God's help, all is yours¹." There was no doubt much boastful talk, and Charles himself, explaining to the inhabitants of Lyons his absence from the meeting of the States-General of Languedoil at Clermont on May 12, declared that he had been advised to go in force to Normandy², and at this same assembly the deputies had offered counsel as to the treatment of the Normans that might surrender to him³. In reality, however, the dauphin's movements were marked by characteristic sluggishness. Though he left Poitiers on the day when the news of the battle reached him, it was not till March 30 that he reached Tours. There he remained ten days and held a full court⁴, entertaining at dinner the Scottish leaders and their English prisoners⁵. The Scots were naturally in high favour. On April 5 Buchan was appointed constable of France. Lands and other gifts were bestowed on the Scottish captains⁶, and John Stewart of Darnley received an astrologer, who forthwith predicted the approaching deaths of Henry V and Charles VI⁷. On April 8 the dauphin left Tours for Chinon, where he stayed a week; from the 15th to the 28th he was at Saumur; on April 29 he at last visited Baugé⁸; and from there he went, by way of Le Mans⁹, to Sablé, where on May 8 he signed with the duke of Brittany the treaty already described¹⁰.

¹ Beaucourt, i. 221.

² Letter in Beaucourt, i. 458 sq.

³ Grandmaison, *Nouveaux Documents sur les États Généraux du XV^e siècle*, 11.

⁴ Beaucourt, i. 222; Cousinot, 181.

⁵ Reg. KK 50, *Chambre aux deniers of dauphin*, quoted by Vallet de Viriville, *J. Chartier*, iii. 315, also in *Cabinet Historique*, iv. 175.

⁶ Cousinot, 181; Bouvier, 441; *Scotichron.* (Hearne), iv. 1218; Beaucourt, i. 222.

⁷ *Ibid.* 223.

⁸ *Ibid.* 225.

⁹ Letter of Jean Caille, in Beaucourt, i. 456 sq.; Bouvier, 441.

¹⁰ See above, p. 290.

Meanwhile the opportunity of pushing home the success gained at Baugé had in great measure been thrown away. During April there seem to have been no military operations on either side. Nothing is known of the last stage of Salisbury's retreat after Baugé, but he apparently hastened back to Normandy without making any serious attempt to hold Le Mans¹. The news of the battle must have become publicly known in Rouen on April 3, if not before, for on that day the *baillis* were ordered to seize into the king's hand the possessions of Clarence and the others who had been slain². On the same day, the authorities forbade anyone to leave Normandy except with licence under the great seal³. On April 8 orders were issued that all soldiers and all Englishmen were to report at once to Salisbury, the seneschal, or the captain of an English garrison for service at the king's wages. The proclamation of the previous January forbidding arbitrary requisitions was republished, and the Norman *baillis* were ordered to visit every part of their spheres of jurisdiction with a view to repressing all malefactors and disturbers of the peace⁴. That strict precautions were necessary was shown by a mutiny of the garrison of Valognes⁵. Shipping was placed under close control, and measures were taken to ensure an adequate supply of grain for the army⁶. On April 25 a circular was sent to a number of captains of towns and castles. It stated that many of them had been exceeding their powers and committing acts of oppression, and therefore defined the limits of their authority and added certain injunctions. They were not to usurp civil jurisdiction, but were to defer to the officers, military or civil, set over them by Henry. No goods were to be levied from communities or individuals. As soldiers often committed acts of extortion to get means to pay for their vices, they were forbidden to keep women or have any irregular intercourse with them; transgressors were to be imprisoned for at least a month,

¹ Bouvier, 441; Juv. 565; Cagny, 121. A day or two after the battle of Baugé, however, the Scottish captains were "around Le Mans"—a phrase which suggests that the place offered at least a little resistance (Joubert, Documents inédits sur la guerre de cent ans, 5). Walsingham (ii. 339 sq.) says that after the battle the enemy took a fortified town previously surrendered to Henry, slaughtering the English garrison. It is hard to see what town this could be but Le Mans.

² Rym. x. 95 sq.

⁴ Rym. x. 99.

⁵ Bréquigny, 227.

³ Bréquigny, 173.

⁶ D.K.R. xlii. 426.

and should not be released until they had given surety for their future good behaviour¹. A few days later John Radcliffe was commissioned to inspect all garrisons, reform what he should find amiss, and punish delinquents². The English authorities, while keeping a firm hand on the territory under their charge, were evidently resolved that disaffection among the Normans should be allayed as far as possible.

The respite from warfare which the dauphinists granted him during April must have been of incalculable value to Salisbury. He soon began attempts to recover the initiative, for at the beginning of May, when the dauphin was at Le Mans, an English force was only twelve miles distant from the town and was believed to be advancing. A battle was expected³, but, for reasons unknown, none took place. After the negotiations at Sablé, the dauphin returned to Le Mans, where he is known to have been with his army from May 15 to 18, being credited with the intention of setting out forthwith for Normandy⁴. It must indeed have been at this time that a force of French and Scots, apparently about as large as that which fought at Baugé, advanced under Buchan and La Fayette, and laid siege to Alençon. The defenders were soon reduced to great straits by the bombardment, and sent an urgent appeal to Salisbury. With as strong a force as he could muster he marched on Alençon⁵. Warned of his approach, the dauphinists drew up their men just outside their siege lines, fortifying their position with their transport vehicles. The relieving force, inferior in numbers, refused to attack, but marched in good order across the Franco-Scottish front at a distance of less than a cannon-shot—a most risky manœuvre. They then retreated, apparently hoping to entice their enemies into a general action on ground of their own choosing. The main force of the besiegers, how-

¹ Rym. x. 106 sqq. Further instructions were enclosed, but these seem to have been lost. It is highly probable that this circular embodies the message sent by Henry when he received the news of Baugé (Vita, 307 sq.). The clause about women is very characteristic.

² Rym. x. 112 sq.

³ Letter of Jean Caille, in Beaucourt, i. 456 sq.

⁴ Letter of dauphin, in Beaucourt, i. 457 sq.; Charles, *L'Invasion anglaise dans le Maine de 1417 à 1428*, 30, n. 2, 78.

⁵ This operation is mentioned only by Chastellain (i. 227 sqq.) and Monstrelet (iv. 40). Its date is approximately indicated by an order of May 22 from the Rouen authorities that all unattached soldiers in four *bailliages* shall join Salisbury "ad resistendum malitie inimicorum nostrorum" (Bréquigny, 177).

ever, would not be drawn, though a part of it attacked the English rear and inflicted considerable loss in killed and prisoners¹. Though the attempted relief of Alençon had failed, the siege was shortly afterwards abandoned, and the dauphinist army withdrew, part to the east, part to the south. No doubt it had been recalled by the dauphin, who had changed his whole plan of campaign, perhaps influenced by surprise at the resolute spirit shown by the English and the failure of the Normans to rush to his aid. However that may be, the French at once had another taste of Salisbury's mettle. For no sooner was Normandy clear of invaders than he led a raid right through Maine into Anjou, following a route further west than that of Clarence. The French discovered his intentions in time to take measures of defence; and an attempt, aided by treachery, to capture Château Gontier ended with the pillaging of the suburbs². But the English scouts appeared before Angers, and altogether it was the finest raid his captains had ever seen; no important man was lost, and they brought home "the fairest prey of beasts that those who saw them ever saw." He offered, if Henry wished, to capture many of the places which he had passed. Raids of this sort were usually of little or no military value; but if ever one was justified, it was this of Salisbury's. For it was the accomplishment of what Clarence had perished in attempting, and a challenge to the dauphinists to fight a return battle. The challenge was not accepted. The enterprise must have gone far to restore the moral ascendancy over the French which the English troops had enjoyed from Agincourt till Baugé, and we may well believe Salisbury's assurance to Henry that "your Peple is gretly Reffreshed with this Rood" and "dredde neure lasse your Enemye thanne theye don at this Day³."

It is true that while Salisbury was absent from Normandy, the French had attempted an operation little less daring than his.

¹ Monstrelet (iv. 40) says that the French followed the English as far as the abbey of Bec, which, however, they judged too strong to attack. Chastellain more credibly asserts that the goal of the English retreat was a strong abbey near at hand (i. 230), though he implies that the French immediately afterwards penetrated as far as Bec. The distance from Alençon to Bec, however, is more than sixty miles, and such an advance would certainly have been noticed by some dauphinist or Scottish writer. Probably Monstrelet and Chastellain confused the attack on Alençon with the subsequent raid on Bec.

² Joubert, *Une tentative des Anglais contre Château Gontier en 1421*, 5 sqq.

³ Salisbury's report to Henry, Rym. x. 131, dated Argentan, June 21. He had returned from the raid on June 17.

Some of the garrison of Dreux, under L'Estandart de Mailly, appeared on the morning of June 13 at the abbey of Bec, and were admitted to the fortifications by the abbey miller. They seized the whole place save a great tower, in which the English garrison, under their captain Ralph Cromwell, took refuge. The defenders, knocking a hole in the tower wall, sent messengers to Bernay, Harcourt, and other neighbouring places. About the hour of vespers, a body of troops arrived under Richard Worcester, captain of Bernay, entered the tower unseen by the careless French, sallied forth, slew many of the French from Dreux, together with two monks and a number of people who had gathered in joy from the surrounding country, took many prisoners, among them the French captain and the abbot, and pillaged the abbey buildings, including the tomb of the Empress Matilda, which was in the choir of the church. On his return from Anjou, Salisbury hastened to Bec, only to find it safe in the hands of Worcester. The property of the abbey was afterwards taken into the king's hand; the monks were all driven out save two; the abbot was taken to Rouen; the miller and others convicted of treason were executed. Henry was eventually convinced of the innocence of the abbot and most of the monks. In October the property of the abbey was restored, and on All Saints' Day the polluted church was reconciled. The king, however, ordered the fortifications to be destroyed at the abbey's expense¹.

Considering the speedy retribution which overtook the French at Bec, Salisbury was justified in telling Henry a week later that Normandy "stod in good Plit and neure so well as now²." That this was so must no doubt be attributed in part to the slackness and incompetence of the dauphin and his advisers, but in the main it was due to Salisbury. In the whole Hundred Years' War there was nothing more resolute, prudent, and skilful than Salisbury's conduct of the affairs under his direction during the three months between the battle of Baugé and the king's return to France.

While Salisbury was raiding Maine and Anjou, the dauphinists had embarked on a new military enterprise—the conquest of the country between Maine and Paris. Why their plans

¹ Bec Chron. 90 sqq.; Verneuil Chron. 222; Bréquigny, 117 sq., 226; Rym. x. 154 sq.

² Rym. x. 131.

were so abruptly changed can only be conjectured. Perhaps the new project seemed easier than the conquest of Normandy. Perhaps it pleased them more to take territory from the Burgundians than from the English. Perhaps stories of disaffection in Paris encouraged them to hope that they might even capture the capital. They certainly gained much initial success, and the speed with which they overran a large tract of country and the ease with which they took numerous strong places testify to the effect which Baugé had had on the spirits of their enemies as well as their own. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that the change of plan was a blunder. A bold invasion of Normandy would have forced Salisbury to give battle, and they might have destroyed his army and ended the war. Instead, they left him and his men at large and spent their vigour and time on reducing a few small and half-hearted garrisons.

By May 25 the dauphin was at La Ferté Bernard¹, ready to enter upon the new campaign. He had with him a large force, including 2000 men under Richard of Brittany, younger brother of the duke, 1200 men-at-arms and 500 archers under Alençon and Aumale, and the Scots under Buchan and Wigtown². The first place attacked was the castle of Montmirail, which had a Burgundian garrison³. The walls were battered by numerous siege-engines, and after about a fortnight the defenders capitulated, their captains joining the dauphinist army, and the defences being levelled with the ground⁴. Thence the force advanced through Perche on Chartres, taking on the way the strongholds of Boisruffin, Beaumont-le-Chétif, and Villebon⁵. Chartres, however, was held by a strong garrison, which included both English and Burgundians⁶. The town was isolated by the capture of surrounding places such as

¹ Charles, *Invasion*, 78; cf. letter of dauphin to Lyons, *Beaucourt*, i. 459.

² *St Denys*, vi. 462; *Juv.* 565; *Monstr.* iv. 45; *Chast.* i. 235; *Cagny*, 121; *La Roque*, *Maison d'Harcourt*, i., *Additions et Corrections*, iv., *Additions au livre I*; *Letter of Jean Caille in Beaucourt*, i. 456.

³ The siege was already in progress during the last week of May (*Charles*, op. cit. 78 sq.).

⁴ *Letter of dauphin to Tours*, *Beaucourt*, i. 228; *Cagny*, 121, who dates the surrender June 10; *St Denys*, vi. 462; *Cousinot*, 181; *Raoulet*, 170; *Bouvier*, 441.

⁵ *Beaucourt*, i. 228; *Cagny*, 121, dates the surrender of Beaumont-le-Chétif June 15. The place is now Beaumont-les-Autels, dep. Eure-et-Loir, arr. Nogent-le-Rotrou, cant. Authon.

⁶ *Letter of dauphin to Lyons*, *Beaucourt*, i. 461; cf. *Chast.* i. 235.

Bonneval¹, Nogent-le-Roi, Maurepas, and Gallardon². The last was taken by storm on June 25, after a siege of less than three days³. The garrison had refused a repeated summons to surrender and the Breton troops were infuriated because one of their captains, Charles de Montfort, had been mortally wounded, so when the town was carried nearly all the inhabitants, armed or not, were slaughtered and the walls in great part destroyed⁴. The dauphin later took up his quarters at the village of Sours, about five miles south-east of Chartres⁵. The besiegers opened a vigorous bombardment of the walls and gates of the city, and did some damage; but the garrison and inhabitants were much cheered by the arrival of the Bastard of Thian, captain of Senlis, a Burgundian leader of some repute, who, having been sent from Paris with a substantial force, fought his way through the dauphinist lines, taking a number of prisoners. He brought the news that Henry had landed in France⁶.

During April and May, England had seen the preparations with which Henry's earlier expeditions had made her familiar. This "voyage" was of course not so elaborate an undertaking. Still, ships and men were requisitioned all round the coasts from Cornwall to the Humber⁷. Provision had to be made for the victualling of the army overseas⁸. Workmen of all kinds—miners, carpenters, smiths, sawyers, masons, tailors, carters, and unskilled labourers—had to be secured⁹. Horses¹⁰ and munitions of war¹¹ must be sent across. Indentures had to be

¹ Monstr. iv. 44; Chast. i. 235.

² Letter of dauphin to Lyons, Beaucourt, i. 461; Nogent-le-Roi capitulated (Fauquembergue, ii. 19).

³ Letter to Tours, Beaucourt, i. 228; Cagny, 122; Cousinot, 182 n.; Verneuil Chron. 222.

⁴ Beaucourt, i. 228; St Denys, vi. 462 sq.; Cousinot, 181 sq.; Cagny, 122; Raoulet, 170; Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1219; Morice, Preuves, ii. 1097.

⁵ Beaucourt, i. 228.

⁶ Monstr. iv. 45; Chast. i. 235; Cordeliers, 296; Flammermont, 226, 276.

⁷ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., April 24, May 9, July 17, 1421, Mich., Feb. 18, 1422; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 384, 387, 388, 390; Rym. x. 108 sq.

⁸ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., June 18, 1421; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 387, 388, 390; Claus. 9 Hen. V, mm. 22, 23.

⁹ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 17, June 18, July 5, 1421; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 386, 387. The tailors were to keep the king's tents in good repair (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 387).

¹⁰ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., July 17, 1421; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 387.

¹¹ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 384—commission to William Scorer of Rotherham to take workmen for making 400,000 arrowheads. A considerable quantity of artillery was evidently transported (Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., July 17, 1421; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 391).

signed with captains¹, and special measures were taken to recruit archers². Some of the troops and much of the equipment and food were shipped direct to Normandy³, but the king himself, with most of the fighting men, was to cross to Calais, and the ships for his passage were collected at Sandwich and Dover⁴. Henry as usual exercised close supervision over what was being done, if we may judge by the fact that on May 13, although his attention was much occupied by parliament, convocation, and the assembly of Benedictine monks at Westminster, he paid a visit to Dover⁵.

By the end of May Henry had left London for good⁶. After a stay at Canterbury, where many of the troops who were to accompany him had been ordered to assemble⁷, he moved his quarters to Dover⁸. On June 10 the duke of Bedford was appointed guardian (*custos*) of England during the king's absence⁹, and on the same day the king embarked. Early next morning he landed at Calais¹⁰.

When the dauphin a few weeks later estimated the force brought over by Henry at 4000 fighting men¹¹, he was not far from the truth. There were nearly 900 knights and men-at-arms and approximately 3300 archers¹², a very large proportion

¹ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., April 24, 1421; Stowe MS. 440, ff. 47 b sqq.; Exch. Accts. 50/10.

² Two hundred were to be raised in Cheshire, and John Arundel, kt., was to find 105, of which 36 were to be miners (Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 17, 1421; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 386 sq.). Four hundred—men of gentle birth, yeomen, or sons of yeomen—were to be recruited in Yorkshire and Lancashire (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 341).

³ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., July 17, Aug. 10, 1421, Mich., Feb. 18, 1422; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 384, 386, 387, 390, 391; Claus. 9 Hen. V, mm. 22, 23.

⁴ Rym. x. 108 sq.; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 17, July 17, 1421, Mich., Nov. 2, 1421; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 341, 387, 388; Stowe MS. 440, f. 47 b; Exch. Accts. 50/1.

⁵ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., March 11 and 19, 1422; Rec. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., May 13, 1421.

⁶ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., Sept. 4, 1421.

⁷ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 341; Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 667/1058-65; Monstr. iv. 43.

⁸ Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 1365/32; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., Sept. 4, 1421.

⁹ Rym. x. 129 sq.

¹⁰ Vita, 308; Cordeliers, 295; Le Fèvre, ii. 37.

¹¹ Letter of dauphin to Lyons, Beaucourt, i. 461.

¹² These totals are derived from a variety of sources, the most notable being Stowe MS. 440, ff. 47 b sqq., which summarises a number of indentures; Exch. Accts. 50/1, recording numerous musters taken at Sandwich in June; *ibid.* 50/10, which checks and sometimes supplements the Stowe MS.; *ibid.* 50/11; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 341, 386 sq., 388. Some of the captains no doubt failed to raise all the men for whom they

of whom were mounted¹. Most of the indentures were dated May 1 and were to run for six months from the date of the first muster, usually fixed for May 23². Arrangements for pay varied. Many captains were promised a quarter's pay in advance³, some even six months', though few got so much⁴; while others, who had merely bargained for monthly wages, managed to induce Walter Beauchamp, the treasurer for war, to give them five months' pay long before it was due⁵.

It is natural to ask why Henry went to Calais at all. Normandy had been gravely threatened when he made his arrangements for crossing the Channel; it was in the west that the main dauphinist force was in the field; and the king's presence was urgently desired in Paris⁶. Had he sailed to Rouen or Harfleur, he could have marched to the capital through territory in the effective occupation of the English, instead of subjecting himself and his men to the fatigues and risks of a long march through country of doubtful sympathies. An answer has been supplied by Henry himself. He had intended,

had indented; but records of the musters show that most of the retinues were up to strength and indeed sometimes above it. Thus, John Cornwall undertook to raise 30 men-at-arms and 90 archers, and at Sandwich on June 16 mustered 39 and 131 (Stowe MS. 440, f. 47 b; Exch. Accts. 50/1). It must not be assumed that the whole of a captain's retinue necessarily mustered at one place. Some of the men serving under Lord Grey of Codnor sailed from Southampton, some from Sandwich (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 384; Exch. Accts. 50/1, 10).

Sir James Ramsay (Lancaster and York, i. 295, n. 1) and Mr Vickers (England in the Later Middle Ages, 379), relying apparently on Rymer's unpublished transcripts from the Patent Rolls, have jumped to the conclusion that Henry's force numbered only about 1000 men, and that these were raised with difficulty. I have found no evidence that recruits were hard to get, still less that "impressment" was more employed, or desertion more feared, than usual (cf. Vickers, 379). If it were true, as Mr Vickers thinks, that only gentlemen or yeomen and their sons were recruited as archers, it would not indicate that men were difficult to secure, but the reverse. As a matter of fact, however, the restriction was mentioned in only one recruiting commission, the object of which presumably was to raise a *corps d'élite* (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 341). Mr Mowat's inference (260) that "Henry meant to spend as little as possible on this new expedition" has no support from facts.

¹ Out of 949 recorded in Stowe MS. 440, only 96 are described as unmounted, but the MS. is only a transcript of originals and its accuracy on this point is not above suspicion.

² Exch. Accts. 50/1, 4, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16; Stowe MS. 440, f. 47 b.

³ Exch. Accts. 50/11.

⁴ Ibid. 50/10.

⁵ Ibid. Doubtless it was the need of large sums to fulfil the terms of the indentures that caused Henry to have £17,000 sent down from the Treasury to Dover while he was there (Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., Sept. 4, 1421).

⁶ Le Fèvre, ii. 37; Monstr. iv. 44.

he said, to put Picardy "in better governance¹," by capturing the places there which were in enemy hands²; and it was the news that the dauphinists were besieging Chartres which caused him to change his plans and hasten to Paris³. No doubt, however, the desirability of an interview with the duke of Burgundy also influenced Henry's choice of route. Philip had apparently done nothing to check the growing power of Harcourt, and it cannot be doubted that he was offended by Henry's behaviour towards Jacqueline of Hainault. Though he sometimes did things which strained the Anglo-Burgundian alliance, Henry must have been sensible of its value to him, and obviously something might be done to make it more effective than it had been since the beginning of the year. Still, an interview with Burgundy did not require the presence of an English army, and Henry's explanation of his movements was no doubt the truth, though not perhaps the whole truth. It is one of the many proofs of the coolness of his judgment. The battle of Baugé he treated as an unfortunate incident, and it had little effect on his military and political plans. His confidence in Salisbury must of course have been immense, for on April 26, when an invasion of Normandy seemed imminent, he gave orders which show that he had already made up his mind to cross to Calais, and take a military force with him⁴. Whether his strategy was right it is hard to say. Certainly Harcourt was a serious menace to Henry's hold on northern France, and so bold and resolute a man was much more to be feared than the dauphin and his corrupt and small-minded counsellors. To crush him at once would enhance Henry's prestige among the Burgundians and provide a tangible success to set off against Baugé. And there can be no doubt that Henry would soon have crushed Harcourt if he could have spared time for the task. But the rapidity of the dauphin's advance in Perche upset his calculations. The dauphinist strategy was unsound, but, as not infrequently happens in such a case, it caused much temporary embarrassment to the other side.

¹ Delpit, 231 (letter from Henry to the mayor and aldermen of London, dated July 12, 1421).

² Jurade, 604 (letter to the people of Bordeaux, dated Oct. 31, 1421).

³ Delpit, 231; Jurade, 604.

⁴ Rym. x. 108 sq. The fifty-seven ships due from the Cinque Ports are to be at Sandwich before May 31, for the king intends to cross the sea against his enemies, and desires their services "in fortificationem Armatae viagii praedicti."

To put heart into the Parisians Henry at once sent forward a party of mounted troops, whose arrival in the capital caused much rejoicing¹. Henry himself, after a few days at Calais, awaiting the arrival of the last troops to embark², moved on by the coast road to Montreuil. On the way, as he himself tells us, he heard of the siege of Chartres. Near the town he was met by John of Luxemburg and other Burgundian lords, sent to greet him by Duke Philip, who had reached Montreuil the day before but was sick of a fever. At Montreuil the king and the duke spent three or four days together³, and they evidently agreed that the destruction of Harcourt must be deferred and that Henry should hasten to Paris while his troops got into position for an attempt to relieve Chartres⁴. The two next went to Domvast, destroying on their march a tower and mill belonging to Jacques d'Harcourt at Maintenay⁵. Not being sure of the temper of the people of Abbeville, the duke now went forward alone to secure their consent to the entry of Henry and his troops into the town. He succeeded with difficulty, and only on condition that no expense should fall on the inhabitants⁶. During his absence Henry went hunting in the forest of Crécy, and visited St Riquier, receiving the surrender of the adjacent castle of La Ferté, which had been garrisoned by Harcourt⁷. The English army merely passed through Abbeville, while Henry, who was honourably received by the townsfolk, spent only one night there. Next day he pushed on with his men, after paying all expenses and bidding farewell to the duke of Burgundy, who went back to Artois to collect a contingent for the Chartres relief force⁸. The king soon left his troops behind, and hurried to Paris through Beauvais and Gisors⁹. He reached

¹ Monstr. iv. 44; Le Fèvre, ii. 37; Cordeliers, 295.

² Musters continued to be held at Sandwich till June 22 (Exch. Accts. 50/1).

³ Jurade, 604; Monstr. iv. 45; Cordeliers, 295; Fenin, 155; Chast. i. 237.

⁴ Delpit, 231; Jurade, 604.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 45 sq.; Cordeliers, 295; Fenin, 155; Chast. i. 238.

⁶ Monstr. iv. 46; Chast. i. 238. The attitude of the inhabitants may have been due to fear of Harcourt, who on May 14 had summoned them to embrace the cause of the dauphin (Champion, Guill. de Flavy, 8, n. 3).

⁷ Monstr. iv. 46; Fenin, 155. The new captain of the castle soon restored it to the dauphinists (Monstr., loc. cit.).

⁸ Monstr. iv. 46 sq.; Le Fèvre, ii. 38. It is characteristic that the Cordeliers Chron., one of the earliest records of these events, says nothing of Henry's difficulties at Abbeville, stating merely (295) that he and the duke were "grandement et joieusement receuz," whereas Chastellain (i. 238) emphasises the reluctance of Abbeville to admit the English king and says that it yielded only out of deference to the duke.

⁹ Monstr. ii. 47; Le Fèvre, ii. 38; Fauquembergue, ii. 19.

the city on July 4, accompanied by a small body of men-at-arms and archers¹.

In Paris things had not been going well for the English cause. As we have already seen, the Parisians were disappointed in their expectation that Henry's arrival in December, 1420, would put an end to their sufferings. Prices, which had risen much during his stay, tended to rise still further after his departure, and there was no alleviation of the burden of the municipal taxes. To add to the prevalent distress, the winter was the longest for forty years; there was snow and frost at Easter, and it remained very cold to the end of May. A month later the vines had not yet flowered, and there was a plague of caterpillars, which did great damage. The more prosperous citizens did what they could to help. On Feb. 2 the master of the Hôtel-Dieu was allowed to issue a special appeal for aid, but of more immediate service was the purchase by certain citizens of private houses which they converted into hospitals for children. By the end of the winter there were three of these, containing in all 120 beds: but such measures were scarcely noticed at a time when people were scrambling for garbage, eating uncooked herbs that pigs would not touch, and devouring the carcasses of dogs².

The authorities, English or French, could not be justly blamed for the state of affairs. Conditions were bad in many parts of France³. The dauphinist strongholds in the vicinity, increased in number by the capture of Villeneuve-sur-Yonne, cut off many of the normal sources of supply⁴, and for that matter the government had to take action against the municipal authorities of Amiens and Beauvais, Burgundian though they were, for having arrested Paris merchants and seized food intended for the Paris markets⁵. In the circumstances, however, it was natural that disaffection should be rife. Many Parisians had fled to dauphinist regions, and their friends often

¹ Fauquembergue, ii. 19. Did Henry visit Rouen on his way to Paris? Two independent authorities say that he did (Cochon, 286; Fenin, 155), and there are extant instructions given by the University of Paris to a deputation sent to Henry at Rouen in June, 1421 (Denifle, Chart. iv. 394), though it is of course possible that the University was mistaken in supposing him to be there. This evidence receives some support from the fact, vouched for by Fauquembergue, that Henry came to Paris from Gisors, which is near the shortest route to the capital from Rouen.

² Bourgeois, 145, 146, 148 sqq., 151, n. 1, 153.

³ *Ibid.* 151, n. 1.

⁴ Cordeliers, 294.

⁵ Ordonnances, xi. 115.

tried to save their property from confiscation¹. After Baugé the duke of Exeter, military governor of the city, lodged continually in the Bastille of St Antoine². Relations between the government and the cathedral clergy were still strained, and in April two canons were put under arrest in their houses by Exeter and ordered to find security for good behaviour³. The currency, which was in a wretched state, was the cause of much apprehension. Attempts to reduce the nominal value of the coins in circulation were generally disregarded⁴, though news of a new ordinance on the subject at Rouen immediately sent prices soaring at Paris⁵. Meanwhile the promised good money could not be coined for lack of gold and silver⁶. The levy of silver, agreed to by the Estates in December, could not be made⁷. For this the government publicly blamed the damnable doings of the dauphinists⁸, but as nothing was done to collect the amount due from Paris⁹, it seems likely that fear of popular disturbances had something to do with their failure.

During June the situation became critical. The dauphinist army was advancing victoriously through Perche. On June 8, by order of the royal Council and the duke of Exeter, the lord of L'Isle Adam, who was then in the city, was arrested and taken to the Bastille on a charge of having conspired to admit the dauphinists to Paris. On his way to prison, some of his men, helped by a crowd of Parisians, with whom he was very popular, tried to rescue him, but Exeter issued from the Bastille with a band of archers, dispersed the mob with a flight of arrows, and brought in his prisoner. The people remained much disturbed; it was reported that the English had killed L'Isle Adam and intended to remove the king from Paris; and it took much persuasion by members of the royal Council and notable citizens to pacify the armed crowds in the streets¹⁰. L'Isle Adam was kept in prison till after Henry's death¹¹. He was never brought to trial, and there is no means of telling whether he

¹ Ordonnances, xi. 113.

³ Grassoreille, 135, nn. 1 and 3.

⁴ Ordonnances, xi. 108, 115; Cordeliers, 295.

⁵ Bourgeois, 153.

⁷ Ibid. 122 sq.

⁹ Douët d'Arcq, ii. 415.

¹⁰ Fauquembergue, ii. 17 sq.; Cordeliers, 296; Monstr. iv. 37; Chast. i. 220; Fenin, 156.

¹¹ Monstr. iv. 37. It was believed that only the intercession of the duke of Burgundy saved his life.

² Cordeliers, 294.

⁶ Ordonnances, xi. 117 sq., 122 sq.

⁸ Ibid.

was guilty of the offence with which he was charged. It was commonly believed that he was imprisoned because Exeter was afraid of his power and influence¹. His irresolute behaviour at Villeneuve-sur-Yonne, however, lends some colour to the accusation brought against him, and there is also the assertion of a writer who evidently knew much about him that he had been in secret negotiation with the governor of that place². About the same time the lord of Châteaouvain was imprisoned in Paris on a charge of treasonable communication with the enemy³.

The arrest of L'Isle Adam showed that an ugly spirit was abroad in Paris, and tempers were not improved by a proclamation, issued the day before Henry arrived, which greatly lowered the nominal value of the current coinage and laid down that rents and debts were to be paid according to the new rates⁴. The discontent of the people at this decree found vent in a public meeting at the Maison de Ville, which perhaps took place during Henry's stay in Paris⁵. Nevertheless the unpopularity of the English must not be exaggerated⁶. They were still disliked less than the "Armagnacs"⁷ and no more than

¹ Cordeliers, 296. In some quarters L'Isle Adam's treatment was attributed to personal pique on the part of Henry. The story went that during the siege of Melun, L'Isle Adam was sent to garrison Joigny against the dauphinists who had been plundering the neighbourhood, and returned to Melun by boat. Soon after his arrival he was summoned by Henry to discuss business relating to his office of marshal. After some conversation the king, noticing his rough grey cloak, asked jokingly if that was the garb of a marshal of France. "Sire," said L'Isle Adam, "I had it made for the journey in the boat down the Seine," and as he spoke he looked the king full in the face. "How dare you look a prince in the face when you speak with him?" said Henry. "Sire," replied the marshal, "the French say that if one man speak to another, whatever his rank or station, with downcast eyes, he cannot be a good man, because he dares not look the other in the face." "Well, that is not our way," retorted Henry. "For God's sake, be not angry with me," begged L'Isle Adam: but, though the incident seemed to be closed, Henry never forgave him (Monstrelet, iv. 9 sq.; Waurin, ii. 338; Fenin, 147; Chast. i. 179). The story, which appears only in Burgundian sources, is perplexing. Henry certainly became irritable in his later years, but it is probable that there was something insolent in L'Isle Adam's tone and manner. At all events, there is no reason to believe that this episode had anything to do with his arrest more than six months later.

² Trahisons, 164.

³ Cordeliers, 296. There is no truth in Chastellain's statement (i. 219) that L'Isle Adam had been deprived of the office of marshal of France during Henry's sojourn in Paris (Fauquemberge, ii. 17, 36 n.).

⁴ Ordonnances, xi. 122 sqq. The ordinance was dated June 26, but not published till July 3. Cf. Bourgeois, 154; Monstr. iv. 47.

⁵ Bourgeois, 155.

⁶ Chastellain's evidence on this matter is of small value. His account of events in Paris at this time is based on Monstrelet or some source common to them both. Monstrelet has nothing about the unpopularity of the English.

⁷ Bourgeois, 163.

some prominent Burgundians¹. When the dauphin took the offensive in the spring, the Parisians were anxious for the return of Henry, "in whom they had great trust," and the news of his return to France was received with joy².

Henry stayed in Paris only four days, and we know nothing of his doings except that he discussed public affairs with Exeter and some of Charles VI's councillors³, and twice visited Notre Dame⁴. The unpopularity of the recent ordinance on the currency evidently affected him, for a few days after his departure a supplementary ordinance offered a measure of relief to tenants of houses⁵.

Meanwhile the force which Henry had brought with him had been advancing under Gloucester, and was now stationed along the Seine, between Mantes and Meulan⁶. On July 8 Henry, with a large number of men-at-arms, left Paris to rejoin it and lead it to the relief of Chartres⁷. Next day he reached Mantes, but in the meantime he had received letters telling him that the dauphin had raised the siege of Chartres and retreated to Touraine⁸. The news was true, though the withdrawal was not quite so precipitate as the dauphin's enemies believed⁹. It was an ignominious end to a campaign so vaingloriously begun. Charles was at pains to excuse himself in a letter written on July 9 from Vendôme to the people of Lyons. He boasts of his early successes and of having remained in the field for three weeks after Henry landed at Calais. He attributes his retreat to lack of supplies and unhealthy weather, which, together with the strength of the garrison of Chartres, precluded a successful issue of the siege. He is now watching Henry's movements and will go to meet him no matter what he may do. For, he adds with pleasing *naïveté*, Henry is not very formidable, seeing that he has brought

¹ Cf. the remarks of the "Bourgeois" on Philippe de Morvilliers and his associates (p. 159).

² Monstr. iv. 44; Le Fèvre, ii. 37.

³ Monstr. iv. 47.

⁴ Fauquembergue, ii. 20; Grassoreille, 136, n. 1.

⁵ Ordonnances, xi. 125. The concession was enlarged four days later (*ibid.* 125 sq.).

⁶ Jurade, 604; Fauquembergue, ii. 19; Le Fèvre, ii. 38, where "Meulan" should certainly be read for "Melun."

⁷ Fauquembergue, ii. 20.

⁸ Delpit, 231.

⁹ The dauphin was at Vendôme by July 5, having fallen back by way of Illiers, Brou and Châteaudun (Beaucourt, i. 229), but there were still dauphinist troops at Sours on the 10th (Morice, Preuves, ii. 1086). The Cordeliers Chronicle says that the dauphin and his army rode twenty-six leagues and more at a stretch, never stopping till they were across the Loire (298).

only 4000 men with him. The dauphinist army, he concludes, will be kept together¹.

The day after Henry reached Mantes he was joined by the duke of Burgundy, followed by a large force of his own subjects². The promptness of his arrival was due to the fact that after the battle of Baugé, his mother had wisely warned him to be ready to go to Paris with an army for the protection of Charles VI, and having taken the advice of an assembly of officials and representatives of the towns of his territories, he had called together troops from Artois, Picardy, and Vermandois, the rendezvous being finally fixed at Croissy, near Breteuil, on June 29³. Thus, when the duke got back to Arras after leaving Henry at Abbeville, he found a force ready to his hand. He led a large part of it, if not all, to the aid of Henry. On July 8 he and his men left Amiens⁴, and two days later he was at Mantes. Henry was evidently much pleased at his zeal, for in a letter to the mayor and aldermen of London, written on July 12, he goes out of his way to describe the duke as a "trusty, lovyng and faithful brother unto us in al thing⁵." Now that Chartres had been saved, however, and the dauphinist threat to Paris removed, Henry had no pressing need for the Burgundian troops; and it was agreed that the duke should lead them back to Picardy and deal with Jacques d'Harcourt⁶.

Henry's line of march towards the Loire being threatened by Dreux, which had of late been giving much trouble to the adjacent country, he resolved to capture it⁷. Dreux was strongly fortified, and the castle, on a spur of the rock which overhung the town, was thought to be impregnable. The garrison too was large and well found in munitions⁸; but the captain, a Gascon knight called Maurigon d'Estissac, was absent, and there was little heart in the defence⁹. Henry's men were before the town by July 18¹⁰. The king took up his quarters at St Denis de Moronval¹¹, about a mile to the east, and the details of the operations seem to have been entrusted to the duke of

¹ The letter is printed by Beaucourt, i. 461 sq. Much the same explanation is given in a proclamation of Aug. 5 (Ordonnances, xi. 126).

² Cordeliers, 296; Monstr. iv. 47 sq.

⁴ Cordeliers, 296; Le Fèvre, ii. 38.

⁶ Monstr. iv. 48; Fenin, 157; Cochon, 286.

⁷ Jurade, 604; Vita, 309; cf. supra, p. 315.

⁹ St Denys, vi. 464; Juv. 566; Bouvier, 441.

¹⁰ Chanc. Warr., Ser. 1, 1365/32.

¹¹ Ibid.; D.K.R. xlii. 429, 431, 433; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 66.

³ Plancher, iv. 30 sq.

⁵ Delpit, 231.

⁸ Vita, 309 sq.

Gloucester and the king of Scots. The siege was pressed with vigour, and after hard fighting the English managed to force an entrance into a large fortified vineyard which adjoined the castle¹. Then the garrison asked for terms, and on Aug. 8 an agreement was signed whereby they were to yield both town and castle unless relieved in twelve days; the townsfolk might remain if they swore fealty to Charles VI and Henry; the soldiers might go where they liked with their goods on giving an undertaking not to take arms against Henry or his allies for a year². On Aug. 20 this treaty was carried out³; 800 dauphinist soldiers and some of the civil population went away; and Henry placed in the town a strong English garrison⁴ under Gilbert Halsall, who was also *bailli* and captain of Évreux⁵. In the castle was the lord of Tillières, who after swearing allegiance to Henry had adhered to the dauphinists; he was excepted from the terms of the capitulation and afterwards hanged. His castle of Tillières had already been recaptured by Gilbert Halsall, who was rewarded with the lands of its lord⁶.

On the fall of Dreux, Henry led his army to Chartres, where he was received with joy, especially by the clergy, and stayed about a week to rest his men⁷. About this time several places in the vicinity of Chartres and Dreux were taken—Nogent-le-Roi⁸, Bonneval⁹, Épernon¹⁰, and others, including Gallardon, which was again carried by assault¹¹. No small part of the territory lost earlier in the summer was thus recovered¹².

Before the surrender of Dreux, Henry had received news that the dauphin with a great army was preparing for battle on the banks of the Loire not far from Beaugency¹³. He had

¹ Vita, 310. Sappers (*pyonarii*) were sent from Paris at the city's expense (*Grassoreille*, 136, n. 3).

² *Ibid.* 311; *Monstr.* iv. 69 sq.

³ *Rot. Norm.* 9 Hen. V, m. 27; Vita, 311; *Monstr.* iv. 69 sq.; *Cochoch*, 286; *D.K.R.* xlii. 416; *Martène and Durand, Anec.* i. 1756 sq.

⁴ Vita, 311; *Monstr.* 69 sq.

⁵ *For. Accts.* no. 61, C; *D.K.R.* xlii. 432.

⁶ *Verneuil Chron.* 223; *Norm. Chron.* (*Hellot*), 66; *D.K.R.* xlii. 415; Vita, 311.

⁷ *Jurade*, 604; *Cousinot*, 183; *Verneuil Chron.* 223.

⁸ Vita, 311.

⁹ *Bourgeois*, 157.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*; Vita, 311.

¹¹ *Cordeliers*, 298; Vita, 311.

¹² It is surprising that Auneau was left in the hands of the dauphinists (*Longnon, Paris*, 21 sq.).

¹³ *Jurade*, 604; Vita, 312.

previously summoned to his assistance part at least of the feudal host of Normandy; and on Aug. 8, with expressions of anger at the small response, he repeated the command for all the *bailliages* save Évreux, Mantes and Gisors, which had perhaps obeyed better than the rest, being nearer the fighting. On the same date he called to his presence all Englishmen and all soldiers in the duchy save those belonging to garrisons¹, while five days later the captains of thirty-eight Norman strongholds received orders to send him what reinforcements they could². The news about the dauphin was founded on fact. The dauphinist army which had besieged Chartres had been ordered to reassemble at Vendôme on Aug. 15, but at a council of war held at Blois and attended by Buchan, the two marshals, the viscount of Narbonne, Tanneguy du Chastel and other notable men, it had been resolved to call out the *arrière-ban* and raise contingents from the towns. The summons was dated Blois, Aug. 5, the rendezvous was at Vendôme on Aug. 25, and the objective of the army was to be the relief of Dreux³. It is not clear what the dauphinist leaders resolved to do when they heard of the fall of Dreux, nor is it certain that there was any concentration of their troops near Beaugency; probably their army was spread out from that region to Vendôme and beyond it⁴. Henry, however, eagerly set out for Beaugency⁵. Châteaudun was held by a dauphinist garrison, and Henry, who arrived before it on Sept. 1, passed on without attempting to capture it⁶. He went through La Ferté Villeneuve⁷, passed not far from Vendôme⁸, and on Sept. 8 was at Messas⁹, about two miles north of Beaugency. Thence he moved on a mile or two to La Bruère, where he took up his quarters for some

¹ Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 26 d. The dates are incorrectly given in D.K.R. xlii. 431.

² Ibid.

³ Ordonnances, xi. 126 sq.; Daumet, 223; Beaucourt, i. 231, 378 sq.

⁴ Beaugency was garrisoned (Cordeliers, 298); there were troops at St Dye (Cousinot, 183); Vendôme continued to be used as the army's base (Bouvier, 441 sq.; cf. the dauphin's letter to Lyons, Beaucourt, i. 231); while on Aug. 28 and Sept. 1 there were many Breton troops at Montoire (Morice, Preuves, ii. 1088 sq.). Henry apparently came to the conclusion later that most of the dauphinists were near Blois (Jurade, 604).

⁵ Ibid.; Vita, 312. Henry's eagerness for battle is emphasised by Monstr. iv. 70 and by Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 66 sq. Cousinot (183) implies that there was reluctance to fight on the part of many French, and describes Henry as hoping for battle.

⁶ Registre et Minutes des Notaires du Comté de Dunois, ed. L. Merlet, 15; St Denys, vi. 464.

⁷ Cousinot, 183.

⁸ Bouvier, 441.

⁹ Called "Mez" in Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 409.

days¹. Beaugency was carried by assault and the town plundered, but the English failed to take the castle². They raided the surrounding country, and the earl of Suffolk, who presumably had come with the Norman reinforcements, crossed the Loire at St Dye with a strong force and reconnoitred the left bank to the vicinity of Blois, returning by the same ford despite the presence at St Dye of a superior force under Tanneguy du Chastel, who incurred much discredit by his refusal to attack³. After some days Henry realised that it was vain to hope for a battle⁴; provisions were beginning to fail, and disease had broken out in the army⁵. He moved up the river past Meung-sur-Loire, and reached the outskirts of Orléans. Some of the suburbs were captured after a sharp fight, and the starving troops found great quantities of wine, which perhaps explains why Henry soon withdrew, after being much harassed by the people of the city⁶. There was now a terrible epidemic of dysentery in the army. Many English soldiers were to be found lying on the roads and in the fields, and many perished at the hands of peasants who had taken to the woods⁷. There was nothing to be gained by remaining in the Loire valley, but Henry was not the man to retire tamely to Paris. There were still ways in which the enemy could be damaged and his own reputation enhanced⁸. Accordingly, the army struck eastward across Beauce and the Gâtinais⁹. It seems to have advanced on a wide front, doubtless to increase the chances of securing food. The king himself went through Nemours to Montereau¹⁰. Others marched by way of Montargis and Châteaurenard to Villeneuve-sur-Yonne¹¹. Some, if we may accept the circumstantial account of

¹ Cousinot, 183. Henry himself says that he was near Beaugency for five or six days (Jurade, 604).

² Cordeliers, 298; Vita, 312; Monstr. iv. 70.

³ Jurade, 604 sq.; Vita, 312; Cousinot, 183.

⁴ "Conoissans que lesditz adverssaires n'avoient voulonte de nous bailler journée," Jurade, 605. In point of fact the army at Vendôme had been broken up by Sept. 1 (see the instructions to the dauphinist envoys to Castile in Daumet, 223).

⁵ Vita, 313; Cousinot, 183; Bouvier, 441; St Denys, vi. 464.

⁶ Cousinot, 183; Bouvier, 442; Vita, 313 sq.; St Denys, vi. 464; Juv. 566; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 67.

⁷ Le Fèvre, ii. 39; St Denys, vi. 464; Juv. 566; Bouvier, 441.

⁸ "Pour nous emploier a faire plus grant exploit de guerre au bien de ce royaume," Jurade, 605.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Vita, 314. Henry was probably at Nemours on Sept. 18 (D.K.R. xlii. 417).

¹¹ Cordeliers, 298.

a late writer, got as far south as Auxerre and Clamecy¹. Throughout the march from Orléans to the Yonne the army continued to suffer from hunger, which caused heavy losses²; but there was not much fighting. Bands of dauphinists shadowed the English; patrols and raiding parties came to blows now and then; and a few places were stormed or yielded; but the only exploit that caught the attention of the chroniclers was the pursuit of a band of French horsemen, and the capture of the castle of Rougemont, where they had taken refuge. Henry had the castle burned, the captain and the garrison hanged, the fugitive horsemen drowned, and the food in the castle rationed among the hungry English³.

No sooner had he reached the Yonne than the indefatigable king ordered siege to be laid to Villeneuve. The sequel was in characteristic contrast to the events of L'Isle Adam's siege in the previous February. Attacked on Sept. 22, the garrison showed little stomach for resistance, and surrendered on the 27th, being permitted to depart with their goods⁴.

On Sept. 28 Henry was at Joigny⁵, and there he seems to have stayed several days⁶. But there was little respite for his troops, who were soon marching north, some going down the Yonne to cross the Seine at Melun, others traversing the forest of Othe, passing through Bray, Nogent-sur-Seine, or Pont-sur-Seine, and thence traversing Brie, where they received the surrender of several small places⁷. The objective of them all was Meaux.

Henry's campaign of 1421 has generally been treated as a failure, if not as indicating a decline in his mental and moral qualities. It is true that he failed to bring the dauphinists to action, and that his losses by famine and sickness were very

¹ Trahisons, 166.

² Vita, 313; Trahisons, 165.

³ Jurade, 605; Vita, 314; Monstr. iv. 70; St Denys, vi. 464; Bouvier, 442; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 67. Rougemont is in the department of Loiret, some three miles south east of Pithiviers.

⁴ Jurade, 605; Vita, 313; Tit. Liv. 92; Monstr. iv. 70; Bourgeois, 157; Bouvier, 442; Fauquembergue, ii. 27.

⁵ Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 22 d.

⁶ Money was received by the keeper of the wardrobe for the expenses of the household at "Iagny" or "Iugny" on Oct. 2 (For. Accts. no. 69, F^{ro} and v^o). This might be a careless writing of "Lagny" (cf. p. 337), but it is very unlikely that Henry was at Lagny so soon (cf. Longnon, 26). The "Vigny-sur-Yonne" mentioned in Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 67, as the place where Henry rested his army is probably a misnomer for Joigny.

⁷ Trahisons, 166.

heavy¹, much greater than those suffered by the other side. Further, if gains and losses be balanced, he held no more of France at the end of September than he had done nine months before. Yet the events of the year afford striking testimony to Henry's military reputation. The successes of the dauphinists were all won in his absence or behind his back. His approach within fifty miles was enough to cause them to abandon a hitherto prosperous campaign on which they had set great hopes. He took Dreux unmolested from without; and later, with an army smaller than theirs², he marched for many miles along the confines of territory that was solidly on their side, and they made it a boast that they had been within "five or six leagues of him³." It may have been good policy on their part to avoid battle, lay waste the country, and trust to hunger and bacteria. But public opinion judges military commanders

¹ There is general agreement on this (Vita, 313; Tit. Liv. 92; Wals. ii. 340; Le Fèvre, ii. 39; Bouvier, 441; St Denys, vi. 464; Juv. 566). The figures of the dauphinist writers, who say that 3000 or 4000 English perished, are doubtless too high. Henry's army was still powerful after its march. Such official figures as we possess suggest that from its landing in France to the beginning of the siege of Meaux, Henry's newly-raised force lost 1300-1400 men. Eight captains, who mustered in all 251 men at Sandwich (Exch. Accts. 50/1), had only 157 on Oct. 23, when the siege of Meaux had been in progress little more than a fortnight (ibid. 50/11; cf. Stowe MS. 440, f. 47 b). Nine others, who undertook to furnish 308 men (ibid.), had only 210 on the same date (Exch. Accts. 50/11).

² The force which Henry recruited in England was evidently, with the exception of two or three retainers, kept together through the summer (Stowe MS. 440, ff. 47 bsqq.; Exch. Accts. 50/1, 10, 11). By Sept. 1 Henry had been joined by Exeter with a force which two months later amounted to 318 men (Exch. Accts. 50/11), but we do not know whence they came: possibly they were drawn from the Norman garrisons. There were, besides, the feudal forces of Normandy. As they served *gratis*, they do not figure in the accounts of the treasurer of war. Such men as came under the old feudal obligation would presumably go back home after forty days. Many landowners enfeoffed by Henry were, however, bound to maintain a permanent contingent if required, and nearly 1400 men might thus have been added to the English field army. But how many troops from Normandy actually took part in the operations in the Loire valley, we have no means of judging. Even allowing for the presence of a few Burgundians from the garrisons of Chartres and other places, one can hardly bring Henry's army, when it set out from Chartres, to a figure above 6000. The dauphinists, on the other hand, had made a special effort to utilise to the full the man-power of their territories, they had the Scottish contingent, and Richard of Brittany, who was with them, had undertaken to bring 3000 men-at-arms and 1500 archers (Beaucourt, i. 231; Blanchard, vi. no. 1515).

³ "Le conte Boucquen. . . Richard de Bretagne, et nos autres chiefz et gens, qui de present sont en tres grant nombre et puissance, ont este par deux jours entiers sur les champs a v. ou vi. lieues seulement des diz ennemis. . ." (letter of dauphin to Lyons, Beaucourt, i. 231). Much the same statement appears in the instructions printed by Daumet, 223, where the dauphin, safe at Amboise, declares that Henry is in retreat, whereas at the time (Sept. 1) he was in full march against the dispersing French army. Cf. Juvénal's statement, apparently written in perfect gravity: "D'un vaillant courage il (the dauphin) s'en vint a Vendosme, distant de douze a quinze lieues de ses ennemis, qui n'estoit pas grande distance" (566).

by their feats of arms, and there can be no doubt that Henry's doings in the summer of 1421 confirmed men in their opinion of his skill and prowess and carried on the work, so well begun by Salisbury, of restoring the moral ascendancy of the English forces, somewhat impaired by Baugé.

Nor were Henry's successes wholly in the sphere of imponderables. At the beginning of 1421 the dauphinists were in an aggressive mood, and their offensive was the most formidable that Henry had ever had to face. He had completely broken it. In August and September they were everywhere on the defensive and had lost almost everything they had gained earlier in the year.

Could Henry have been reasonably expected to achieve more? He seems to have obeyed the first principle of strategy and to have made the destruction of his enemies' forces his prime object. As they wished to avoid battle, it is hard to see how he could have forced an action without exposing himself to unwarrantable danger. Perhaps he should have landed in Normandy; yet the overthrow of Harcourt was imperative, and in any case the dauphinist army in Perche would have had ample warning of his approach. On the other hand, he can hardly be blamed for turning his back on Harcourt when he heard of the danger of Chartres. Nor should he be condemned for stopping to besiege Dreux. The dauphin was resolved not to fight just then, or he would not have retreated so fast or so far; and Dreux in enemy possession was a menace to southern Normandy and a nuisance to Paris. As soon as the dauphinists seemed to have recovered a combative spirit, Henry marched against them without troubling to besiege hostile places in his path. And when once more his hopes of battle were disappointed, he immediately struck at them as hard as he could, cleared the line of the Yonne in order to restore safe communication between Paris and Dijon, and then swiftly transferred his army to Meaux, the most valuable possession of the dauphinists in northern France. The position in France when he returned in June, 1421, offered the most difficult problem in strategy that he was ever required to solve, and it has never been shown how he could have dealt with it more prudently. It may indeed be argued that Henry's military talents never appeared to better advantage than in this summer. The Agincourt campaign was foolhardy; the conquest of Normandy called for energy,

patience, and careful attention to detail, but made little demand on generalship. In 1421, however, Henry displayed a resourceful opportunism and a quickness and coolness of judgment which entitle him to rank as one of the greatest military leaders of the Middle Ages. There was at all events no sign in his behaviour of that ungovernable ferocity which, according to Scottish writers¹, he habitually exhibited after Baugé; in fact there seems at this time to have been no indication of any decline in his mental or physical powers.

That few Burgundian troops served under Henry in 1421 was due not to any disloyalty on the part of Duke Philip, but to his preoccupation with a campaign of his own in Picardy. At Mantes it had been agreed between him and Henry that he should return thither to crush Harcourt². But on his way back alarming news reached him. While he was hastening to join Henry, two well-known dauphinist captains, Guy de Nesle, lord of Offémont, and Poton de Saintrailles, with a strong force of mounted men, had entered Vimeu from the south, crossed the Somme at Blanchetaque, and, uniting with Harcourt, taken St Riquier—a success which was followed by the recovery for the dauphin of the castle of La Ferté, the capture of other strong places³, and several attacks on Abbeville, which they tried to set on fire with flaming darts. It was a well-timed stroke; in fact, the dauphinist movements just at this time were most adroitly executed, whether they all belonged to a concerted scheme or not.

The duke, recognising that the troops with him would not suffice for his augmented task, summoned reinforcements from all parts of his territories. Arriving at Amiens, he asked for provisions and men, a request granted both there and by most of his own towns⁴. He had victuals brought to Abbeville, fearing lest want of food should impair the loyalty of the inhabitants⁵. At the end of July, after recovering Pont Remy on the Somme, with one or two smaller places, he laid siege to

¹ Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1217; Lib. Pluscard. i. 357. His treatment of the garrison of Rougemont was indeed brutal, but there was probably some special reason, good or bad, for it, since a few days later the defenders of Villeneuve were dealt with leniently.

² Monstr. iv. 48; Cordeliers, 298.

³ Monstr. iv. 48 sq.; Fenin, 157; Raoulet, 177; Champion, Guill. de Flavy, 8, n. 5.

⁴ Durand, iv. 92 sq.; Monstr. iv. 49 sq.

⁵ La Picardie, iii. 148 sq.

St Riquier¹. He now had with him an English force from Calais consisting of archers and officered by old gentlemen². Nevertheless the siege did not prosper, though great stores of material were collected for the construction of siege-works, and the duke had a strong force of artillery³. The investment of the town was not thorough, and the defenders made many vigorous sorties, in which on the whole they gave more than they got⁴. Meanwhile Harcourt had called for relief to the dauphinist captains in the Beauvaisis, Thiérache, Valois, Brie, and Champagne, and a force of some 2000 men mustered around Compiègne and Soissons under some very famous leaders, including Louis de Nesle, brother of the lord of Offémont, Gilles and Louis de Gamaches, Poton de Saintrailles, who had evidently been sent to collect help, La Hire, Pierron de Luppé, and Jean Raoulet⁵. On Aug. 29 Duke Philip heard that this force was advancing through Vimeu towards the Somme, with the object of joining Harcourt. He despatched a reconnoitring party across the river at Abbeville, and under cover of night broke up the siege of St Riquier⁶ and went to Abbeville himself with his whole army. Early next morning he was informed that the dauphinists, notwithstanding the loss by a singular accident of the valuable services of La Hire⁷, were making for the ford of Blanchetaque, on the east side of which Harcourt would be awaiting them. The duke and his cavalry immediately set forth to intercept them. The two forces soon came in sight of each other, but the dauphinists won the race to the ford. The tide was in, however, and none could cross save Poton de Saintrailles and three others, who swam over. The rest turned to fight their pursuers, while Harcourt, who was on the farther bank with some of his men from Le Crotoy and part of the St Riquier garrison, made no attempt to join them, but went back to his headquarters. The fight that followed, known as the battle of Mons-en-Vimeu, was a hard-fought combat, waged mainly

¹ Monstr. iv. 51 sqq.; Durand, vi. 92.

² "Tous archiers et anciens gentilsz hommes qui les conduisoient," Cordeliers, 299. The English contingent however left during August on the ground that the duke now had enough men without them (*ibid.* 300).

³ La Picardie, iii. 149 sqq.

⁴ Monstr. iv. 54 sq.; Raoulet, 178.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 56; Raoulet, 178; Cordeliers, 300; Le Fèvre, ii. 40; G. de Roye, 183; La Picardie, iii. 152.

⁶ Champion, 9, n. 4.

⁷ He was sleeping in a house in a village, when a chimney collapsed, fell on his leg, and lamed him for life (Bouvier, 443). No other writer mentions the mishap to La Hire.

between cavalry, in which neither side displayed much tactical skill. The dauphinists charged through the Burgundian centre, most of which fled in panic, crossing the Somme at Picquigny and spreading far and wide the news that the duke was defeated and slain. Part of the duke's centre nevertheless stood by him, and the two wings came to his aid. There was a hot fight, in which, as the Burgundian writers affirm with suspicious emphasis, the duke performed great feats of valour. Eventually the dauphinists gave way, and were pursued for some distance. Those who had been chasing the fugitives of the Burgundian centre presently began to return. They were, however, unable to reverse the fortune of the day, though after the fighting was over Jean Raoulet and Pierron de Luppé occupied the battlefield with a body of horse, collected the wounded, and took them to St Valéry-sur-Somme, an achievement which was apparently regarded by Raoulet as justifying his description of the fight as a dauphinist victory¹.

The numbers engaged in the battle were not large. No writer of authority estimates the dauphinist force at more than 1600 men-at-arms, while it was probably much smaller². The Burgundian cavalry in the battle—few archers can have been present—seems to have numbered about 1000 men³. The dauphinist losses were heavy, and many of their notable men fell into the hands of the enemy, among these being Louis de Nesle, Gilles and Louis de Gamaches, and the ubiquitous Poton de Saintrailles, who must somehow have recrossed the Somme⁴.

The dauphinists had so far achieved their purpose that Duke Philip did not attempt to renew the siege of St Riquier. He had of course sustained loss in the battle, while his enemies had been strengthened by the junction of Raoulet and Pierron de

¹ This account of the battle is based mainly on the narratives in *Monstr.* iv. 59 sqq., and Raoulet, 179 sqq., some details being derived from *Le Fèvre*, ii. 41 sqq. and *Cordeliers*, 300 sqq. Raoulet, who commanded the dauphinist "battle" (*Bouvier*, 443) speaks very well of himself, but the *Cordeliers Chron.* (303) also mentions his prowess specially. That the date was Aug. 30 is confirmed by *La Picardie*, iii. 52.

² *Le Fèvre*, ii. 41, says they had upwards of 1500 lances, by which he presumably means individual men-at-arms. The *Cordeliers Chron.* (300), whose author seems to have been well informed about these operations, gives them only 800 men-at-arms. As between two Burgundian estimates, the lower is to be preferred. *Monstrelet's* figures are 500 or 600 men-at-arms and 300 or 400 archers (iv. 68), but as he says that 400 were killed, it looks as if he had somewhere misread his authority (iv. 63).

³ This is the figure of the *Cordeliers Chron.* (301).

⁴ Raoulet, 180; *Cordeliers*, 304; *La Picardie*, iii. 152.

Luppé with Harcourt¹. The duke in fact disbanded his army and returned to the Netherlands². But he had in his valuable prisoners a surer means of gaining his end than force of arms. Eager to recover their freedom, they promoted a proposal of the duke's that they should be released in return for the surrender of the captured Burgundians and of St Riquier itself. After lengthy negotiations the suggested arrangement was accepted by the lord of Offémont, who yielded the place in November and withdrew with his men to the region of Compiègne³.

The battle of Mons-en-Vimeu made a considerable stir. Paris heard of it on Sept. 1, and apparently doubted whether it was a victory or not, for it was made the occasion of processions for the safety and prosperity of the realm⁴. In England it seems to have been regarded as rather a bad business, if we may judge from the confused account given by Walsingham⁵. At Bruges it was believed that the duke, though victorious, had suffered great losses, and that he was willing to negotiate for peace or a long truce⁶. By Sept. 9 a minstrel had made a song about the fight, which he sang to the duke at Boulogne⁷. In the neighbourhood where the battle took place, it had the effect of inducing the dauphinist garrison of Douvrier castle to surrender to the Burgundians who were besieging it⁸.

Harcourt of course remained at Le Crotoy, and was destined to give much further trouble. But his importance was on the decline and henceforth was merely local. Had the duke of Burgundy been defeated, the dauphinists would have established their power over a solid wedge of territory extending from Champagne to Le Crotoy, and would have severed direct communication between Paris and the Netherlands. That danger, at any rate, had been removed.

¹ Raoulet, 181; Monstr. iv. 65; Cordeliers, 305.

² He was at Boulogne on Sept. 9 and St Omer next day (*La Picardie*, iii. 154 sq.).

³ *Le Fèvre*, ii. 43 sq.; Monstr. iv. 72; Cordeliers, 306. The arrangement was expensive for the duke, who had to buy valuable prisoners from his captains before it could be carried out. He gave John of Luxemburg 2000 francs for Louis de Nesle (*La Picardie*, iii. 152).

⁴ Fauquembergue, ii. 24.

⁵ *Wals.* ii. 340 sq.

⁶ Morosini, ii. 210 sq.

⁷ *La Picardie*, iii. 154.

⁸ Cordeliers, 304; Monstr. iv. 68; Fenin, 171.

CHAPTER LXXI

MEAUX

IT was high time that something was done to check the activity of the dauphinists in Meaux. In the previous December, according to a dauphinist writer, the Parisians had begged Henry to stop their ravaging and burning in the adjacent country, but he had told them that such things were the usage of war and that war without fire was like sausages without mustard, and they had to content themselves with a promise that some day the place should be besieged¹. The depredations of the garrison had naturally continued, and it was now advisable to humour the Parisians, who were in a critical temper². Accordingly, as we have seen, troops were sent northward after the fall of Villeneuve-sur-Yonne, with orders to concentrate at Lagny-sur-Marne³. Meanwhile the duke of Exeter was despatched in advance to Meaux, under instructions to seize the suburbs before the garrison could burn them. He arrived just in time; and the French, offering resistance, were driven into the town by the English archers⁴. The main English force soon followed and invested the place⁵; but Henry, who was at Lagny by Oct. 12⁶, stayed there for a fortnight, superintending the construction of the siege-engines⁷.

Henry was faced with a task of great difficulty. The town of Meaux had originally straddled the neck of a pear-shaped peninsula formed by the river Marne. The Romans, however, had cut a channel through the isthmus just to the south of the town and had thus diverted the river, though the old bed still

¹ Juv. 561. The authority for the story is not good.

² Bourgeois, 155.

³ Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 1365/33; Monstr. iv. 70.

⁴ Jurade, 605; Monstr. iv. 71; Cordeliers, 305; Chast. i. 283; Juv. 562.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 71, says that the investment was complete on Oct. 6, but as late as the 12th it was possible for civilians to travel from Meaux to Paris (Longnon, 26).

⁶ Ordonnances, xi. 132.

⁷ Monstr. iv. 71; Cordeliers, 305; Rym. x. 155; For. Accts. 69, F. About this time, Crécy, farther up the Marne, together with several strongholds in Brie and the Île-de-France, surrendered (Jurade, 605).

received a little water under normal conditions and sometimes filled to overflowing in winter. Opposite the town, on the south or left bank of the main stream, lay a fortified suburb, called the Market, which had come into existence during the Norse invasions of the tenth century. On three sides it was protected by the Marne, which here had a very rapid current; to the south a canal had been dug from one reach of the river to another, so that the Market stood on an island. Both town and Market were strongly protected by walls and ditches¹.

The garrison, according to Burgundian writers, numbered 1000 fighting men². Louis Gast, *bailli* of Meaux, was in the town³, but the military commander was Guichard de Chissay⁴, who had under him some famous warriors, notably Pierron de Luppé and the Bastard of Vaurus, a most ferocious ruffian⁵. Some of the leaders doubtless knew that they had little mercy to expect from Henry, and they evidently inspired the whole garrison with a spirit of desperate resolution.

As an example of scientific siege warfare, the leaguer of Meaux was probably Henry's masterpiece. Only the sieges of Rouen and Melun can be compared to it; and at Rouen he had relied mainly on hunger, while at Melun the stubbornness of the resistance seems to have surprised him, and his operations lacked system. At Meaux, however, he pressed the siege from the first with great vigour and according to a preconceived plan. The duke of Exeter was stationed between the north wall of the town and the original river bed, close to the abbey of St Faro, which he had saved from being burned by the garrison. The earl of March lay on the east, while a force of picked knights was posted on the west⁶, both of these divisions occupying ground beyond the old course of the river. To the south of the Market, and therefore separated from the rest of the army by the main stream of the Marne, lay the earl of Warwick. The

¹ Carro, *Histoire de Meaux*, 11 sq., 64, 103, 104, 106, 112 sq.; Vita, 315; Tit. Liv. 92. By far the best account of the siege is in the *Vita Henrici*. The Burgundian writers also supply valuable information, but the dauphinists are untrustworthy and meagre.

² Monstr. iv. 71; Le Fèvre, ii. 45.

³ Rym. x. 212; Bourgeois, 173; Juv. 562; St Denys, vi. 452; Vita, 328; Tit. Liv. 93.

⁴ Devon, 375; For. Accts. 56, E v^o; St Denys, vi. 450; Juv. 562.

⁵ Vita, 315, 328; Tit. Liv. 92; Monstr. iv. 71; Le Fèvre, ii. 245; Fenin, 172; Cordeliers, 305; Bouvier, 441; Juv. 562; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 68; *Abrégé des Grandes Chroniques*, in J. Chartier (Vallet de Viriville), iii. 249. Of these authorities, the English, all the Burgundians except Le Fèvre, and Bouvier among the dauphinists erroneously style the Bastard captain of the garrison. Evidently he had very great influence on the defenders.

⁶ Vita, 316.

English lines were fortified with palisades and ditches¹, and a bridge of boats was thrown across the river to furnish easy communication between Warwick's men and the rest of the besieging force². The king established markets where the troops could buy provisions and other commodities³. The siege-engines, which seem to have been specially numerous and formidable, were speedily set up on their emplacements and began a vigorous bombardment⁴. On leaving Lagny in the latter half of October, Henry himself at first lodged in the castle of Rutel, within a mile of the town⁵. At the beginning of December his headquarters were the abbey of St Faro, and there he remained for the next three months⁶.

How many men Henry had with him when the siege began cannot be precisely estimated. The accounts, warrants, and receipts of William Philip show that nearly all the captains that contributed to the force raised by Henry in England remained with him before Meaux, at least for a time. They also show that very few other English commanders can have taken part in the siege. We know that in the last days of the year there were 1700 fighting men in Henry's pay before the town, and with the labour corps and household staff the total reaches nearly 1900⁷. Philip's records tell us too that seventeen retinues which were engaged in the siege at the end of October lost approximately sixteen per cent. of their strength in the next two months⁸, and there is reason to believe that one or two important contingents, present when the siege started, remained but a short time⁹. All things considered, it is probable that Henry began the siege with about 2500 Englishmen. There seem to have been few French troops concerned. Arthur of Richemont brought a Breton contingent, but it cannot have

¹ Monstr. iv. 71.

² Vita, 316.

³ Ibid. 317.

⁴ Ibid.; Brut, ii. 428; Monstr. iv. 71; Le Fèvre, ii. 45. Le Fèvre speaks with great admiration of Henry's conduct of the siege—"belle chose estoit a veoir son siege."

⁵ Jurade, 605; Vita, 316; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 403; For. Accts. 69, F; Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 1365/27, 669/1138, whence it appears that Henry was still there on Nov. 25. The remains of the castle are now a farm.

⁶ For. Accts. 69, F; Chanc. Warr., Ser. I, 1365/34, 35; Rym. x. 163, 181, 186, 188, 190, 194; D.K.R. xlii. 437, 439; Bréquigny, 193; Ordonnances, x. 154; Godefroy, Annotations, 798. Repairs were carried out at St Faro in November or December (Douët d'Arcq, Comptes de l'Hôtel, 278).

⁷ Exch. Accts. 50/10. The list of the household staff is not complete.

⁸ Ibid. 50/10, 11.

⁹ Notably those of John Cornwall and Lord Scales, For. Accts. 69, G v^o. Cf. Exch. Accts. 50/1.

been large, and, as we shall see, was soon sent elsewhere¹. French labourers were employed², and a contingent under a Savoyard captain took part in the final assault on the town³. But the chroniclers write as though the siege had been conducted almost exclusively by English troops; indeed, the Burgundians seem anxious to make it clear that their duke and his principal captains had nothing to do with it⁴.

The king directed the operations with his usual unremitting vigilance. The town was assailed with increasing vigour as the garrison refused his offers of favourable terms⁵. The artillery—"gounnys, trepgettis, and engenys"—battered the walls; under cover of a "sow" men filled the ditches with earth; mines threatened the defences from beneath⁶. The garrison, however, were equal to all emergencies. They mended their broken walls, cleared their choked ditches, and dug counter-mines. Their watchfulness foiled all attempts at surprise⁷. Their sorties, though always repulsed, were frequent and vigorous, and their artillery was very destructive⁸. Their resistance was supplemented by the weather, which in December became very cold and wet. The river filled its old bed, flooded a great tract of country, isolated each of the four divisions of the besieging army, and compelled Henry to evacuate his siege lines for a fortnight and make new ones farther from the town⁹. The defenders seized the opportunity to make sorties in boats, which the English wholly lacked, and inflicted much loss with but few casualties to themselves. The flood of course added to the difficulty of bringing supplies, and when it subsided the dauphin's horsemen beset the roads, striving to intercept the provision convoys—an annoyance difficult to counter, since the English had been constrained to send their horses away. Henry had bread made for distribution among the troops, and daily gave food at his headquarters to about 1000 persons¹⁰. Never-

¹ See below, p. 343. ² For. Accts. 69, F v^o. ³ Monstr. iv. 82; Cordeliers, 309.

⁴ The chronicle of Peter Basset and his associates includes very few Frenchmen in its list of captains present at the siege of Meaux (Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, ff. xlv b sqq.). It names many in its corresponding list for the siege of Melun (ff. xl sqq.).

⁵ Vita, 319 sq.

⁶ Ibid. 317, 320; Brut, ii. 428. Henry had seven German gunners at the siege ("Goikyn Guner et sys ses compaignons duchmen"); there were also Nicolas Mason, an English gunner, with two mates, and John Rolf, another, with three (Exch. Accts. 50/10).

⁷ Vita, 320.

⁸ Ibid.; St Denys, vi. 448; Juv. 562.

⁹ Cordeliers, 310.

¹⁰ Vita, 318; Tit. Liv. 92; Bourgeois, 160. A bonus of wheat was given to the troops holding an exposed position called the Bulwark and to certain gunners, artisans, and labourers who were conspicuous for meritorious service (For. Accts. 69, F v^o).

theless there was much suffering¹; desertions were numerous²; even the officers sometimes lost heart, and there were heard mutterings that the English people had consented to the conquest of Normandy, but had never bargained for an attempt to conquer all France³. It is probable that in the eight weeks before Christmas Henry lost, in dead, missing, and disabled, about sixteen per cent. of his troops⁴. But his zeal for discipline remained as strong as ever, and a foreign soldier who stole a pyx from St Faro's abbey was tried, convicted, and hanged⁵.

Had the dauphin and his advisers, who spent most of the winter at Bourges⁶, despatched a strong force to the relief of Meaux, it would have had an excellent chance of success. There was, as usual, much parade of what the dauphin was going to do. On Nov. 26, in an announcement that he was about to mortgage or alienate some of his domain, he declared that he meant to assemble the greatest army that he could raise, both from France and from allied states, and to devote the greater part of his resources to fighting the English⁷. Jean Juvénal dutifully asserts that he did everything possible to relieve Meaux⁸. But he was at this very time living most extravagantly, and his court was apparently much more interested in the preparations for his marriage than in the perils of the Meaux garrison⁹. Bands of dauphinist cavalry, often attacking Henry's communications, sometimes ventured to approach his siege lines in some force; but they were always driven off with little trouble¹⁰. Such serious operations as the dauphinists undertook during the siege affected regions remote from Meaux, and if they were designed with the object of drawing Henry away, they quite failed of their purpose. On Oct. 25, the Burgundian captain of Cosne reported that he had been warned of the advance on Gien of the viscount of Narbonne with a strong force, which had as its object a raid on the Nivernais and an attack on La Charité-sur-Loire¹¹. Nothing more is known of this enterprise,

¹ Wals. ii. 340; Tit. Liv. 92; St Denys, vi. 448; *Abrégé des Grandes Chroniques* (J. Chartier, iii.), 248.

² Wals. ii. 340.

³ St Denys, vi. 448; Juv. 562; Fenin, 176.

⁴ Exch. Accts. 50/10, 11.

⁵ Vita, 318 sq. This might be taken to be an echo of the famous story about Bardolph, which belongs to the Agincourt campaign (see above, ii. 116 sq.), were it not that the author of the Vita also records that incident in its proper place (53).

⁶ Beaucourt, i. 232.

⁷ Ordonnances, xi. 141 sq.

⁸ Juv. 563.

⁹ Beaucourt, i. 233 sqq.

¹⁰ Vita, 318.

¹¹ Plancher, iv. p. xiv.

and, as the warning came from a dauphinist, it may have been a fabrication designed to divert attention from western Normandy, where soon afterwards an important stroke really was attempted.

During the summer, the diplomatic relations between England and Brittany had remained ambiguous¹. On the one hand, the duke's brother Richard was serving in the dauphinist army with a large force of Breton troops throughout the campaign². On the other hand, his other brother, Arthur of Richemont, while visiting the duchy in the interests of England, recruited the contingent which he afterwards took to aid Henry at Meaux³. One gets the impression that the duke was uncertain whether Henry or the dauphin was the more likely to win, while his subjects supported either or neither side as they pleased. The situation gave the dauphinists a chance of organising an attack on Normandy across the Breton border, and such an enterprise was being planned in the second half of September, the direction of it being entrusted to Jean d'Harcourt, count of Aumale, the dauphin's lieutenant-general in Normandy and captain of the garrison at Mont-St-Michel⁴. Early in October Richard of Brittany and Amaury de Severac, one of the dauphin's marshals, invaded Lower Normandy⁵, and at the beginning of November a force of Bretons and dauphinist troops from the south captured Avranches by a surprise attack⁶. Their leader was Olivier de Mauny⁷, lord of Thiéville, Jean d'Harcourt's lieutenant at Mont-St-Michel, who had probably sworn allegiance to Henry in 1419⁸. The English took prompt counter-measures. The authorities in England seized all Breton ships in the ports from Bristol to Seaford⁹, and on Nov. 9 the Norman Council ordered all capable of bearing arms in Normandy and the

¹ See p. 363.

² Above, pp. 316, 331, n. 3.

³ Cosneau, 62, n. 3; Beaucourt, i. 339 sq.; Blanchard, vi. 58; D.K.R. xlii. 432; Rym. x. 157 sq.

⁴ Chron. de Mont-Saint-Michel, i. 107, 114, n. 1.

⁵ Brit. Mus. Add. Ch. 11,474.

⁶ Cordeliers, 307; Monstr. iv. 80; cf. Bréquigny, 188.

⁷ Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, f. xlv b; Halle, 108 sq.

⁸ Chron. de Mont-Saint-Michel, i. 107, 110; D.K.R. xli. 804. He served in the dauphinist army at the siege of Chartres (Morice, Preuves, ii. 1086) and in the subsequent operations in the Loire valley (Lobineau, ii. 979, 982). Basset and his fellows, like Halle, were mistaken in identifying him with the defender of Falaise (Chron. de Mont-St-Michel, i. 107 n.).

⁹ Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 12.

conquered territory, save those required for garrison duty, to hasten to St Lô to serve under the duke of Gloucester¹ against the invaders. As in the previous April, precautions were taken to prevent a rising of the Normans, and efforts made to check abuses². Henry detached troops from the army at Meaux, including the Breton contingent, but if the invaders hoped to attract him to Normandy in person, they were disappointed³. In December Avranches was recaptured⁴, and about the same time the earl of Suffolk, who was in command on the Breton frontier of the duchy⁵, with Lord Scales and John Ashton, the capable *bailli* of the Cotentin, encountered a force under Olivier de Mauny at Parc L'Évêque, not far from Mont-St-Michel, and after a hard fight defeated it with great loss⁶. Among the prisoners was Mauny himself. Henry had him taken to Meaux, where he rebuked him for his breach of faith, but instead of putting him to death, sent him in the following summer to the Tower of London, where he died soon after his arrival "for very shame and mere Malyncoly"⁷. Despite Suffolk's victory, however, Normandy was again invaded early in January, and the feudal forces of all the *bailliages* save Caux and Mantes were called upon to take the field under Salisbury⁸. Presumably the French withdrew without a battle.

After Christmas no striking incident marked the progress of the siege of Meaux till, towards the end of January, Henry had as his guest the duke of Burgundy. Philip was anxious to visit the duchy and county of Burgundy, where he had not been since his father's murder, and a large force had been sent thence to Flanders to escort him⁹. After spending Christmas at Arras, the duke set out for Paris, which he reached on Jan. 5, 1422¹⁰. His troops, who had behaved badly in Artois and Picardy¹¹,

¹ Bréquigny, 188.

² *Ibid.* 190; D.K.R. xlii. 435; Rym. x. 160 sq. On Dec. 1 all commercial intercourse between Normandy and Brittany was forbidden (Bréquigny, 230).

³ Rym. x. 157 sq.; Cordeliers, 307; Monstr. iv. 80.

⁴ Cordeliers, 307; Monstr. iv. 80.

⁵ Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 22 d.

⁶ Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, ff. xlv b sq.; Halle, 109; Cordeliers, 308.

⁷ Halle, 109; Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, f. xlvi; Devon, 375; For. Accts. 56, E v^o.

⁸ Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 12 d.

⁹ Monstr. iv. 74; Cordeliers, 306.

¹⁰ Monstr. iv. 76; Le Fèvre, ii. 46; Bourgeois, 163.

¹¹ Monstr. iv. 75; Chast. i. 288. The municipal authorities of Amiens had nevertheless begged him not to leave Picardy (Durand, ii. 34).

pillaged the surrounding villages, leaving only what was too hot or too heavy to carry off¹. The complaints of the peasants to the Burgundian leaders were received with jeers. Even in Paris itself, though he was given a ceremonious welcome, the duke was not liked. The issue of some new coins of small value, which were unpopular, was attributed—quite wrongly—to his influence, and men began to contrast the sacrifices they had made for the Burgundian cause with the disregard for the interests of Paris which he and his father were thought to have shown. His manner of life, too, caused scandal. He was considered to have all Duke John's faults. For his father's death he seemed to care nothing; he was entirely under the influence of certain young knights, and led just such a damnable life as the duke of Orléans and other lords who had come to a shameful end². It is worth remembering that these strictures come from a writer who is often described as a fanatical Burgundian. It is also noteworthy that he never offers any personal censure of Henry V.

While at Paris the duke visited Charles VI, who was with his queen at Bois de Vincennes³. On Jan. 16 he left Paris for Meaux, accompanied by Jean le Clerc, chancellor of France, Louis of Luxemburg, bishop of Thérouanne, a governor-general of finance, and Pierre Cauchon, bishop of Beauvais⁴. He stayed before Meaux till the 23rd and had lengthy conversations with Henry⁵. Charles VI was probably at St Faro⁶ during his stay⁶, but it is not known whether he was permitted to be present at the discussion of the affairs of his kingdom by his two sons-in-law. While the duke was before Meaux, he arranged the marriage of his sister Marguerite and Arthur of Richemont, who was still there⁷, but the main topic discussed was the possibility of coming to some agreement with the dauphinists⁸. The relations of Henry and the duke seem to have been harmonious, but it was ominous that the prince of Orange, who had led the duke's escort from Burgundy, refused to go

¹ Bourgeois, 163.

² *Ibid.* 165. Cf. regarding the new coinage, *Ordonnances*, xi. 146 sqq. and see below, p. 383.

³ *Monstr.* iv. 78.

⁴ Fauquemburgue, i. 375 n., 387, ii. 26, 35, 159; Borrelli de Serres, iii. 137 sq.

⁵ *Monstr.* iv. 78; Plancher, iv. 41.

⁶ He witnessed grants there on Jan. 24 (*Ordonnances*, xi. 154; Godefroy, *Annotations*, 798).

⁷ *Chronique d'Arthur de Richemont*, 25 sq.

⁸ *Beaucourt*, i. 339. See below, p. 374.

to Meaux and went with many other lords to Troyes, where they awaited their master. Their motive, it was commonly believed—probably with truth—was to avoid taking the oath to observe the treaty of Troyes¹.

Having concluded his business with Henry, the duke went back to Paris, whence on Feb. 6 he set out on his journey to Dijon², calling again at Meaux on the way³. His subsequent doings will be described later. Soon afterwards, Henry was visited by John of Luxemburg, one of the most famous and zealous of the Burgundian captains. His business was private. His brother Peter, count of Conversen, was a prisoner in the hands of Pierron de Luppé, and, thanks to Henry's mediation, he was able to secure his release in return for a heavy ransom. The count was so grateful that he remained with Henry and rendered useful service during the remainder of the siege. John of Luxemburg went back to Picardy, of which he was captain-general⁴.

Meanwhile, there was no marked change in the situation at Meaux. Conditions in the English lines seem to have improved, though desertions were still taking place⁵. Supplies for the king's household were sent out from England⁶, munitions of war continued to be ordered⁷, and Henry's labour corps was reinforced⁸. Casualties became much fewer, and from the end of December to the end of March averaged only 4·3 per cent. a month, or little more than half the proportion shown by the records of the autumn⁹. Even if we assume that aggressive operations languished during the three months in question¹⁰, the losses are still astonishingly light, and it looks as if the English army, however much it may have grumbled, was cared for fairly well. It must be remembered that it contained a great

¹ Monstr. iv. 78 sq.; Chast. i. 292; Cordeliers, 308.

² Monstr. iv. 79; Cordeliers, 308; Plancher, iv. 42.

³ Rym. x. 173.

⁴ Monstr. iv. 79 sq.; Cordeliers, 308 sq.; Fenin, 173; Anselme, iii. 726.

⁵ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 421.

⁶ Ibid. 420, 421; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Jan. 23, 1422.

⁷ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 391; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Dec. 13 and 20, 1421.

⁸ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 421, 422.

⁹ This estimate is based on the pay-warrants for thirty-six retinues, which reveal their numbers at the end of December and at the end of March. The total fell from 1154 to 1004 (Exch. Accts. 50/10, 15). A few retinues were bigger in March than in December, a reminder that gaps may sometimes have been filled by drafts from England, though it is plain that this did not occur often.

¹⁰ The Vita Henrici (320), however, leaves the impression that Henry never allowed the siege to degenerate into a mere blockade.

many raw troops, who were having their first experience of winter warfare.

Despite the valour of the garrison of Meaux, their surrender was of course inevitable unless the dauphin could relieve them before their food ran out. None heard their appeals, however, but the lord of Offémont, whom they had repeatedly asked to come and command them. On March 9 he tried to enter the town with some forty picked men. Though the success of the undertaking could hardly have made much difference to the general situation, it seems to have been cleverly planned. Under cover of night Offémont and his men stole through the English lines to the north of the town, killing one or two sentries whom they encountered. They reached the walls undetected at a place where they had been partly destroyed by the English siege-engines. There they found ladders which the besieged, warned of their intentions, had let down, draping them with bed-clothes, so that the English guard, going their rounds, would not notice them against the white stone of the wall. Many of the band mounted successfully, but Offémont somehow fell into a ditch¹. He was in full armour, and the ditch was so deep that he could not reach the spears which his men thrust down for him to grasp. The noise which the mishap caused attracted some of the English sentries, who raised the alarm; and after a sharp fight, Offémont, badly wounded in the face, was captured with a few of his followers, and led before Henry, who was immensely pleased at the issue of the episode².

The failure of Offémont's enterprise greatly disheartened the garrison. They knew that most of the townsfolk were willing to admit the English and that a mine which Henry had dug was almost ready³. In the morning therefore they began to move provisions and other goods into the Market⁴, intending, it was believed, to set the town on fire and kill all those who were not privy to their design⁵. In their haste they left the

¹ One account states that he fell in while crossing the ditch on an old plank (Monstr. iv. 82); at Paris it was said that Offémont was climbing one of the ladders, when the man in front of him dropped a heavy bag of herrings which struck him on the head and knocked him into the ditch beneath (Bourgeois, 167).

² Monstr. iv. 81 sq.; Bourgeois, 166 sq.; Cordeliers, 309; Fenin, 176 sq.; Vita, 320 sq.; Fauquembergue, ii. 39 sq. Some escaped, including Jean de Flavy, who is said to have "run like a hare" (Champion, Pièces Justificatives, lxxi, lxxii).

³ Bourgeois, 167; Fenin, 173.

⁴ Bourgeois, 167; Monstr. iv. 82; St Denys, vi. 450; Vita, 321.

⁵ Bourgeois, 167.

walls unguarded, and one of the burghers mounted the ramparts, shouted to the English what was happening, and urged them to attack boldly. They raised a ladder for him to descend, and he was taken before Henry, to whom he emphatically repeated his story. Meanwhile, the men of a Savoyard captain, stationed at another part of the wall, had observed what was happening in Meaux, and made a sudden assault by escalade¹. By Henry's orders the attack was soon taken up on all sides; little resistance was encountered; the fighting men took refuge in the Market and the townsfolk in the churches. Henry, however, had it cried through the streets that all should go to their houses and pursue their ordinary avocations. He and many of his men took up their quarters in the town².

Spring was now at hand, and it was very desirable to free the English army for other operations. The siege of the Market was accordingly pressed with great energy. The place was exceedingly strong, and Henry relied mainly on his artillery in his efforts to reduce it. At the end of the long bridge from the town to the Market, he placed many engines, which maintained an incessant bombardment of stones. Part of the bridge could be raised; but Henry devised a great structure of wood, which was dragged on wheels to the bridge from outside the town, and a platform projecting from this spanned the gulf. After bitter fighting the greater part of the bridge passed into the hands of the besiegers, who seized the mills built on and under it, thereby diminishing the food-supply of the defenders and securing some shelter from their incessant missiles³. The English also got possession of an adjacent island, where they mounted a great force of artillery, which soon did much damage to the walls of the Market⁴.

Towards the south, the earl of Warwick somehow got a "sow" on to the land between the canal and the wall of the Market, which here rose to a broad parapet or terrace, at the back of which was a second wall, an attack being thus faced by a double line of defenders⁵. The earl nevertheless captured an outwork close to the wall, whence he directed a very

¹ Monstr. iv. 82; Cordeliers, 309; Fauquembergue, ii. 40.

² Monstr. iv. 82 sq.; Cordeliers, 310; Bourgeois, 168; Vita, 321; Exch. Accts. 50/15; For. Accts. 69 F.

³ Vita, 322 sq.; Monstr. iv. 83; Cordeliers, 310; St Denys, vi. 450; Juv. 563.

⁴ Monstr. iv. 83; Fenin, 174.

⁵ Carro, 103.

destructive rain of missiles. On the west, where Walter Hungerford was in command, the Market was farther from the mainland. But here, by means of boats and wooden bridges, men crossed and set up wooden shelters near the walls, from which they harassed the besieged with attack and bombardment. In this quarter the defenders made counter-attacks of special fierceness, even making breaches in their own walls to gain readier access to the English¹. At least one of their sorties, here or elsewhere, was disastrous for the English, to Henry's great chagrin²; but the grip of the besiegers could not be shaken off, and soon the French were glad to close up the breaches again. At length the attackers pushed a shelter close to the walls and began a mine³.

Throughout the siege of the Market the English losses were heavy, and the earl of Worcester⁴ and Lord Clifford were killed by projectiles⁵. At Easter⁶, out of reverence for the season, Henry granted the defenders a truce of some days; but afterwards fighting was resumed more fiercely than ever. In several places the walls were now breached, and on Hungerford's side the defenders all slept on or close by the walls in the open⁷. A summons to surrender, with the offer of good terms, being again disregarded, Henry ordered a general assault. It was made with great violence, and the French were pressed hard; but they fought with desperate valour, and after seven or eight hours the English were driven out of the defences⁸.

The untiring Henry now resolved to attack the eastern end of the Market, hitherto immune by reason of the fierce current at that side. He lashed together two large boats, set on them a platform of great beams, reared on each boat two high masts, and in the space thus formed, with the masts as corner-posts and the platform as foundation, he built a lofty wooden tower with two "chambers" or storeys. The upper one

¹ Vita, 323 sq.

² All the English concerned were killed or taken, save one who fled. There was a story that Henry had a pit dug, buried him in it up to the neck, and starved him to death (St Denys, vi. 450 sq.; Juv. 563. Jean Juvénal evidently got the story from the St Denis chronicler).

³ Vita, 324 sq.

⁴ G.E.C. (ed. Gibbs), i. 27; Vita, 325; St Denys, vi. 450; Juv. 563. He was buried in Tewkesbury abbey (G.E.C. loc. cit.; Leland, Itin. [ed. Toulmin Smith], iv. 159).

⁵ Inq. post mort. Hen. V, 64/37; G.E.C. (ed. Gibbs), iii. 293; Vita, 325. He was buried at Bolton priory in Wharfedale (Kingsford, Lit. 290).

⁶ April 12.

⁷ Vita, 325; Monstr. iv. 91.

⁸ Monstr. iv. 91 sq.; Fenin, 174.

rose higher than the loftiest tower of the fortifications, close to which the erection was to be manœuvred, so that a bridge might be let down on to the ramparts. The value of the structure is said to have been proved by experiment made afterwards¹, but towards the end of April, before it could be used, the defenders, worn out and despairing of relief, asked to be allowed to treat². Henry was in a truculent mood, for not only had the siege cost him many men and seven months of precious time, but he deeply resented the insulting behaviour of the garrison throughout its course. He seems to have been specially annoyed with a man who blew a horn, though how the instrument's notes gave offence is not explained³. More intelligible, though still childish, was his vindictiveness towards others of the garrison who took an ass on to the ramparts and beat it till it brayed, calling out to the English that they ought to come and rescue their king⁴. Possibly his anger was partly due to a suspicion that his own troops, whose morale seems to have been none too good, rather relished the gibe at their higher command. He was consequently at first indisposed to listen to overtures; but on second thoughts concluded that it was wise to negotiate⁵. He therefore commissioned Exeter, Warwick, the count of Conversen, and Walter Hungerford to discuss terms of surrender with deputies of the garrison⁶. The negotiations lasted several days⁷, but on May 2 an agreement was signed.

The Market was to be surrendered on May 10. In the meantime, all hostilities were to cease, and no one should enter or leave it without licence. An inventory of the provisions and horses in the Market was to be given to Henry; munitions of war, valuable goods, and the moveable possessions of churches and religious houses were to be collected in assigned places, ecclesiastical property (it was implied) being destined for restitution. All prisoners in the hands of the garrison or any

¹ Vita, 325 sq.

² Ibid. 326 sq.; Monstr. iv. 93; Juv. 563. Juvénal mentions lack of food as one of the causes of the surrender, but the garrison still had a certain amount of grain, though owing to the loss of the mills it was doubtless difficult to get it ground (For. Accts. 69, I, whence it appears that seventy-three quarters of grain were found in the Market after the surrender; cf. Fenin, 175, who says that the garrison still had food for three months).

³ Rym. x. 212; Monstr. iv. 94.

⁵ Vita, 327; Tit. Liv. 93; Fenin, 174.

⁶ Rym. x. 213; Monstr. iv. 93.

⁴ Ibid. 93; Fenin, 173.

⁷ Ibid.

member of it were to be freely released. The defenders themselves should remain prisoners. In general, their lives were to be spared, but to this undertaking there were a number of exceptions. Twelve of the most conspicuous leaders, among them being Louis Gast, Guichard de Chissay, Pierron de Luppé, Jean de Rouvres, the Bastard of Vaurus, and his cousin Denis¹, were to be at the mercy of Charles VI and Henry. Of these, Louis Gast, Jean de Rouvres, the Bastard, and his cousin were to "be putte to her Dome, and Dome and Justice shall be done and ministred to them." Several others, including Guichard de Chissay, Pierron de Luppé, and Philippe de Gamaches, were to purchase their lives by the surrender of all towns or strongholds under the command of them or persons connected with them. The offensive horn-blower, the gunners², all in any way concerned in the murder of Duke John of Burgundy, all Englishmen, Irishmen, and Scots in the garrison, together with any of the defenders who had previously sworn to the treaty of Troyes, were likewise to be dealt with at the discretion of the two kings, in fact, that is to say, of Henry. A hundred persons of the garrison were to swear to the agreement, and twenty-four—among them several of those specified above—were at once to be handed over³.

The terms of the capitulation were duly executed, and on May 10 the Market passed into the possession of the English⁴. Henry made a ceremonious entry and stayed in the Market for some days⁵. The booty taken was probably considerable, for much property had been brought to Meaux from the surrounding country. The king arranged its distribution, keeping munitions of war and valuables for himself, and giving to the

¹ Bourgeois, 170. Monstrelet (iv. 96) and Fenin (175) say that he was the Bastard's brother, but the Bourgeois was evidently well informed about the family.

² Gregory, 143. The text in Rymer (x. 212) has "governers." Either reading makes sense, but Gregory's version is supported by a passage in the *Vita Henrici* (328) where after speaking of the execution of some of the prisoners the writer adds, "et quotquot saxivomorum furore Anglos per tempus obsidionis occiderant, consimilem sententiam perpassi fuere."

³ The English text of the capitulation is given in Rymer, x. 212 sqq., and in Gregory, 143 sqq. Monstrelet, iv. 93 sqq., has an abridged version in French, the order of the articles differing somewhat from that in the English text. Chastellain (i. 303 sqq.) paraphrases Monstrelet. Cordeliers Chron. (314 sq.) gives a good summary. While following the English text in the main, I have found the Burgundian writers useful in several places where its meaning is obscure.

⁴ *Vita*, 327; Denifle, Auct. ii. 287. Some of the hostages were taken to Paris on May 7 (Fauquembergue, ii. 45).

⁵ Monstr. iv. 96.

poor some of the grain¹. On May 14 Henry announced that the inhabitants of the town who had taken part in the siege might have their property restored, provided that they swore to the treaty of Troyes and repaired the fortifications before All Saints².

Immediately after the surrender many of the prisoners were sent away³. Some were incarcerated in Paris⁴, where, according to Jean Juvénal, not a few perished of hunger⁵. On May 15, 150 were despatched by boat to various prisons in Normandy and England. The bishop of Meaux, who was one of the party, shared a small boat with a knight, and was seemingly unchained; but the rest were fettered in twos by the legs, and heaped together "like pigs," with one loaf of black bread among three or four and very little to drink⁶. During the summer there were prisoners from Meaux at Rouen⁷, Pont de l'Arche, and Caen⁸. In June 151 were taken to England⁹. They were lodged for a while in the Tower, but during July, with others who had arrived earlier, were distributed among various castles, mostly in Wales¹⁰. Guichard de Chissay and Pierron de Luppé were committed to Pontefract castle under the guard of Robert Waterton¹¹.

Others of the prisoners were less fortunate. Louis Gast, who was supposed to have countenanced the misdeeds of the Bastard of Vaurus, and Jean de Rouvres, described as an

¹ For. Accts. 69, 1; Vita, 327 sq.; Tit. Liv. 93; Wals. ii. 343; Monstr. iv. 96; St Denis, vi. 452. It is evident that exaggerated reports of the wealth of the place were current in both England and Normandy (Kingsford, Lit. 290; Norm. Chron., Hellot, 68). In the chapel of the Market were found 105 books, nearly all of canon law or theology. These were carefully preserved by Henry and afterwards passed to his son (Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 4603, ff. 134 sqq.).

² Bourgeois, 169, n. 1; Monstr. iv. 96.

³ The party of 100, which reached Paris on May 7, presumably consisted for the most part of prisoners taken at the fall of the town (Bourgeois, 169; Fauquembergue, ii. 45). On the 9th they were sent by boat to Normandy or England (Bourgeois, 169).

⁴ Monstr. iv. 96.

⁵ Juv. 563.

⁶ Bourgeois, 170.

⁷ Monstr. iv. 95.

⁸ Exch. Accts. 188/7, f. 32. Those at Caen—three gentlemen and six varlets—were kept in irons.

⁹ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 335; For. Accts. 59, A; Devon, 375 sq.; Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., July 10, 1422; Exch. Accts. 50/24.

¹⁰ Flint was allotted 8; Rhuddlan, 20; Conway, 12; Carnarvon, 20; Chirk, 15; Harlech, 30; Holt, 15; Kenilworth, 20; Nottingham, 24; Pontefract, 6 (Rym. x. 225 sq.; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 335; Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Easter, July 10 and 15, 1422; For. Accts. 56, A, A v^o, B v^o, C v^o). The usual allowance for a prisoner's keep was 2s. a week (For. Accts. 56, *passim*). Two of the Harlech prisoners died soon after reaching the castle, and two more during their journey back to London in the following December (ibid. A v^o). Those at Holt, Chirk, Carnarvon, Flint, and Nottingham, who remained in those castles till the following winter, all survived their sojourn (ibid. A, A v^o, B v^o).

¹¹ Ibid. E v^o; Devon, 375 sq.

advocate, whose offence is not specified, were tried and sentenced to death by the *prévôt* of Paris. They appealed in vain to the king's Council, and on May 26 were beheaded in the Halles¹. The poor horn-blower met the same fate²; and the heads of all three, affixed on lances, were displayed at the place of execution, while their bodies were hung on the gibbet at Montfaucon³. As for the Bastard of Vaurus, he was drawn through Meaux on a hurdle and then hanged on an elm near the town, where he had put to death many victims of his own cruelty. His body was left hanging; his head was stuck on a lance at the top of the tree, and his banner was placed to float beside it⁴. The tree also served as gallows for his cousin Denis⁵.

Even Jean Juvénal, though he says that Henry was criticised by some for treating a "gentleman" in this way, is constrained to admit that others thought the Bastard's fate a divine punishment for his cruelty⁶. The Monk of St Denis evidently approves of Henry's action⁷. So of course do the Burgundian writers, especially the "Bourgeois," who tells a ghastly story of the Bastard's brutality to a young peasant woman. Having seized and murdered her husband, he robbed her of the ransom money which she had brought in ignorance of his death, and then, stripping her more than half naked, pregnant as she was, he bound her to his elm, where her head was brushed by the feet of earlier victims as they hung swinging in the wind. There he would have left her for the night, but before dawn the wolves, attracted by her cries of anguish, saved her from further suffering⁸. It is no wonder that many Frenchmen preferred the English to "gentlemen" of their own nation and the English king who hanged the Bastard to the French prince who had rewarded this gentleman for his good services⁹.

Historians have frequently regarded the siege of Meaux as on the whole a misfortune for Henry, seeing that it cost him so much time and so many men. But in capturing the place Henry was doing more than rooting out a nest of dauphinist

¹ Fauquembergue, ii. 49; Vita, 328; Tit. Liv. 93; Monstr. iv. 96; Cordeliers, 315; Chast. i. 306; Bourgeois, 173; St Denys, vi. 452; Juv. 563.

² Le Fèvre, ii. 54; Chast. i. 306.

³ Monstr. iv. 96; Chast. i. 306.
⁴ Vita, 328; Tit. Liv. 93; Monstr. iv. 96; Cordeliers, 315; Le Fèvre, ii. 54; Bourgeois, 170; St Denys, vi. 450; Juv. 563; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 68.

⁵ Vita, 328; Bourgeois, 170.

⁶ Juv. 563.

⁷ St Denys, vi. 450.

⁸ Bourgeois, 171 sq.

⁹ On Nov. 30, 1419, the dauphin gave 250 *livres* to the Bastard of Vaurus for his good services (J. Chartier [Vallet de Virville], iii. 249 sq.).

raiders. The military situation in northern France was at once fundamentally altered.

After the failure of Offémont's attempt to enter Meaux, the dauphinists had made no further effort to relieve the garrison. Their only enterprise during the siege of the Market was a surprise attack by the garrison of Marcoussis on Meulan. The capture of this place, which occurred on April 5, was embarrassing to Paris, since it cut communication by river between the capital and Normandy¹. Prompt counter-measures were taken. All boats on the Seine below Mantes were seized by English officials to hinder any advance of the enemy downstream². All available Englishmen and soldiers in Normandy were ordered to join Salisbury at Mantes³, and the king despatched a force from Meaux under the count of Conversen to assist in the recovery of the lost town⁴. Salisbury laid siege to the place, and on April 15 the dauphinists surrendered and were allowed to depart with all that they could carry⁵. This was apparently regarded in Paris as a somewhat unsatisfactory conclusion of the episode, and it was recognised that until the Market of Meaux fell Henry would have to content himself with modest successes elsewhere⁶.

Meanwhile, the Burgundians had begun a new movement against Jacques d'Harcourt, who since Oct. 6 had been commissioned as the dauphin's lieutenant in the marches of Picardy and the Somme⁷. During the winter he had not achieved much, his most ambitious enterprise, a raid into Vimeu, being repelled by English troops from the garrisons of eastern Normandy. Harcourt's losses were heavy, he himself was wounded, and the lord of Verduisant, captain of St Valéry-sur-Somme and one of his most important lieutenants, was taken prisoner⁸. Nevertheless, Harcourt remained secure in his possession of Le Crotoy, and his presence there rendered the Channel unsafe for English shipping⁹.

¹ Fauquembergue, ii. 42; Monstr. iv. 85; Cordeliers, 310; Bourgeois, 168 sq.

² D.K.R. xlii. 448.

³ Rym. x. 201 sq.

⁴ Monstr. iv. 85; Cordeliers, 310.

⁵ Fauquembergue, ii. 43; Cousinot, 184; Monstr. iv. 86; Cordeliers, 310; Bourgeois, 169.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Bibl. nat., Portefeuilles de Fontanieu, 111-112, f. 246. The MS. has "Seine" but this is palpably a mistake for "Somme."

⁸ Monstr. iv. 76; Le Fèvre, ii. 46; Cordeliers, 307 sq.

⁹ Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 3.

Early in March an important council of war was held at Bapaume. It was attended by John of Luxemburg, the Burgundian captains commanding castles in Picardy, and the officials of the king and of Duke Philip in the Picard marches. It was resolved to initiate aggressive operations in Vimeu, Vermandois, and the Thiérache. The campaign in Vimeu was to be conducted by John of Luxemburg himself, and the duke attached so much weight to it that he wrote more than 400 letters to Flemish nobles urging them to support the enterprise¹.

Towards the end of March the force under John of Luxemburg entered Vimeu from the east, and on the 26th laid siege to the castle of Quesnoy-sur-Airaines, a few miles west of Picquigny, the garrison of which had been giving much trouble to the surrounding country. The walls were soon breached by siege-engines, and the castle was carried by storm, some of the garrison being held to ransom, others sent to Amiens, where they were executed². After burning the castle, the Burgundians went on to Gamaches, where they were joined by Ralph Butler, captain of Eu, with upwards of 200 English troops³. Gamaches was besieged⁴, but it was held by a strong dauphinist garrison⁵, and perhaps deeming it too formidable to assault, the united forces turned eastward, and after reducing one or two minor strongholds, sat down on April 11 before the two castles of Airaines, one of the most notable centres of dauphinist power in northern France. The garrisons resisted stoutly, confident of relief; as in the previous August, the dauphinists about Compiègne tried to rescue their comrades in the north; and near the end of April a relief force of several hundred men was mustered under the lord of Gamaches, Poton de Saintrailles, and other captains. At the same time Harcourt gathered fresh troops around Le Crotoy, and three vessels brought him a strong body of men-at-arms by sea⁶. John of Luxemburg,

¹ Cordeliers, 309; Plancher, iv. 53.

² Cordeliers, 310; Monstr. iv. 84 sq.; Fenin, 177 sq. Amiens sent to take part in the operations twenty crossbowmen, a number of workmen, and its big gun, with a great bombard which had been brought from England (Durand, ii. 35, iv. 92, 94, 96, 97, 99).

³ Monstr. iv. 85; Durand, iv. 93.

⁴ The siege was in progress on April 7 (Rym. x. 202).

⁵ Fenin, 302. The siege artillery from Amiens seems not to have been sent to Gamaches.

⁶ Cordeliers, 310 sq.; Monstr. iv. 85, 87 sq.; Fenin, 178; Durand, ii. 35, iv. 92, 94, 97.

however, called successfully for reinforcements, Butler's contingent being more than doubled¹, and having now 700 men-at-arms and 2000 archers he felt strong enough to detach 300 of the cavalry and 400 archers to meet the relief force that was advancing from the south. Under the command of Ralph Butler and Hue de Lannoy, recently appointed master of the crossbowmen², they came into touch with the enemy at Pierrepont. The dauphinists were attacking the castle. On the approach of the Burgundians and the English, however, they set fire to the town and withdrew. They were vigorously pursued, the archers making their way along a blazing street and subsequently skirmishing with the dauphinists, who turned and faced them on a hill a little way from the town. For some time it looked as if a pitched battle would take place. The dauphinists, mounted, were on the top of the hill, the English and Picards, on foot, at the bottom. Neither side wished to take the offensive, but at last the Picards, losing patience, mounted their horses and rode up the ascent. Although the English, true to their traditional tactics, refused for some time to leave their position, the dauphinists would not receive the attack, and having the fresher horses were able to escape without material loss³. The affair, though trivial in itself, sealed the fate of Airaines, for the relief force scattered, and on May 10 the two castles agreed to surrender next day, unless previously relieved. The defenders were suffered to depart with their goods, with express permission to join any dauphinist garrison between the Seine and Le Crotoy. One of the Airaines castles was destroyed, the other manned by a Burgundian garrison⁴. John of Luxemburg's operations were evidently regarded as highly successful, if we may judge by the space which Burgundian writers allot to them. He had, it is true, reduced several dauphinist centres. But he had done little towards reducing the enemy's man-power, and the net gain of the

¹ Rot. Norm. 10 Hen. V, m. 25 d; Cordeliers, 312.

² His appointment was dated St Faro near Meaux, Jan. 22, 1422 (Godefroy, Annotations, 797).

³ Cordeliers, 312 sqq. This chronicler gives a most vivid and interesting account of this small operation. He calls the English commander the "conte d'Eu," but Monstrelet's account (iv. 88 sqq.), though on the whole less valuable, shows that he was Ralph Butler, who was captain of Eu. It is tantalising to have such full and clear information about a little skirmish, when the main features of Agincourt and Baugé are largely a matter of conjecture.

⁴ Cordeliers, 316; Monstr. iv. 90 sq.; Fenin, 179 sqq.; Durand, iv. 97.

Burgundians in territory was after all not so great, for about this time the lord of Gamaches took by surprise the castle of Mortemer, near Montdidier, and used it as a centre from which to ravage the neighbourhood¹. As long as desultory enterprises for the acquisition of ground and buildings absorbed the energy of the military forces of Duke Philip, no end to the war could be foreseen. John of Luxemburg, to do him justice, was not disposed to rest on his laurels; after the fall of Airaines he gave his troops a rest, but ordered them to assemble a fortnight later at Péronne, in order to besiege the castle of Moy². By that time, however, the Market of Meaux had surrendered.

The capitulation of Meaux was notable not only because it placed in Henry's hands a formidable stronghold, but still more because it put out of action a considerable number of excellent troops and carried with it the conquest of numerous other places of military consequence. Five prominent men were to be at Henry's mercy until all castles or towns under their command or that of persons connected with them were surrendered³. It is not known how many places were concerned, but the clause seems to have been effective, for we do not hear that any of the five suffered death under it. Thus Pierron de Luppé secured the surrender of Montaigu castle, which dominated a large area, and had wrought much injury to the region of Rheims and Laon⁴. More profitable, from Henry's standpoint, was Philippe de Gamaches, abbot of St Faro, who had taken an active part in the defence of the town. To save him from drowning, with which Henry was believed to have threatened him, his brother Guillaume, lord of Gamaches, undertook to surrender the town of Compiègne with the castles of Remy, Gournay-sur-Aronde, Neuville-en-Hez, Mortemer, and Cressonsacq, not to mention others in the same

¹ Cordeliers, 310; Monstr. iv. 85.

² Cordeliers, 316.

³ The clause in which this stipulation occurs is severely abridged by Monstrelet, and its meaning in Rymer's text is not very clear: "Also, as touching the forsaid Guicharde de Chysse, Peryn de Rupe (*sic*), Maister Robert Groesme, Philip de Gamaches, and John Danno. . . [they shall] dwel and abyde to her [Charles VI's and Henry's] Will. . . unto the time that Touns and Strengthes, that hem or eny of hem, or other on her behalfe, or by other that any thing sholden moove (*sic*) done for hem, bene holden, bene yelden, and deliverid to the said Kingis. . ." (x. 212). Doubtless the words which I have printed in italics were regarded by Henry as justifying his threat to kill Philippe de Gamaches unless his brother surrendered the strongholds in his charge.

⁴ Monstr. ii. 98; Cordeliers, 317. Montaigu surrendered on May 28 (Fœdera, App. D, 246).

region, on condition that their garrisons might go free¹. The bargain was carried out in the middle of June². Henry, furthermore, drew no small advantage from his lucky capture of Offémont. He had nothing to do with the capitulation of the Market, but before long he obtained his freedom by swearing to be faithful to the treaty of Troyes, and surrendering a number of places in Valois, including the town of Crépy and the castles of Pierrefons, Mello, and Offémont, the custody of which he was allowed to retain, his uncle Raoul de Coucy, bishop of Noyon, and two others giving security for his loyalty³.

Many other dauphinist strongholds on the borders of Beauvaisis, in the region of St Quentin, and near Amiens, surrendered or were evacuated and destroyed by their garrisons at this time⁴. Whether this was in consequence of the terms of the capitulation of the Market of Meaux or whether it was due to the fear which that event inspired, it is not possible to determine. In any case, the capture of Meaux cleared away all serious threat to communications between Paris and the Netherlands, and as the English and Burgundians were meeting with further successes in Vimeu, Henry could boast at the end of June that only Guise, Le Crotoy, and St Valéry-sur-Somme remained to the dauphinists in all France north of Paris.

¹ St Denys, vi. 452; Juv. 563 sq.; Monstr. iv. 97; Fenin, 177; Cordeliers, 317. Remy is in dep. Oise, arr. Compiègne, cant. Estrées-St-Denis; Gournay-sur-Aronde in dep. Oise, arr. Compiègne, cant. Ressons-sur-Matz; Neuville-en-Hez in dep. Oise, arr. and cant. Clermont; Mortemer in dep. Oise, arr. Compiègne, cant. Ressons-sur-Matz; Cressonsacq in dep. Oise, arr. Clermont, cant. St Just.

² Monstr. iv. 103; Cordeliers, 317; Fenin, 177; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 69; Sorel, *La Prise de Jeanne d'Arc*, 51, n. 2, 321.

³ Champion, 14, n. 1; Monstr. iv. 97; Cordeliers, 317; Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 69. He received letters of pardon and indemnity in July, 1422 (Bourgeois, 166, n. 1).

⁴ Monstr. iv. 97, 98; Le Fèvre, ii. 56; Cordeliers, 316, 317; Durand, iv. 97.

CHAPTER LXXII

THE INDEFATIGABLE DIPLOMATIST

HOWEVER much he might be absorbed in military operations Henry never lost touch with international politics, and during the winter of 1421-1422 he had, as usual, many diplomatic irons in the fire. On the one hand, he was striving to increase his strength by securing more effective aid from his friends and by winning over neutrals or enemies; on the other, he was beginning, very cautiously, to prepare the way for a renewal of negotiations with the dauphinists. In neither direction did his efforts yield much fruit. In some quarters, indeed, affairs went very badly for him. At Genoa the doge Campo Fregoso was driven from power, and in November, 1421, the city passed under the lordship of the duke of Milan on terms which he had settled with the French¹. The treaty of the previous May between Henry and the Genoese of course fell to the ground², and henceforth dauphinist influence was paramount in north Italy. The duke of Milan allowed dauphinist agents to recruit men in his territories and a force of Lombards joined the dauphinist army in the following June³.

In some other quarters Henry's diplomacy, while not encountering such definite reverses, failed to secure its objects. With Scotland relations changed but little during the last year of his reign. King James remained in France⁴. Henry kept in touch with the earl of Douglas⁵, though there is no evidence that the latter fulfilled his undertaking to join Henry at Easter, 1422, with a body of troops. One or two Scots went to France during the winter at the head of small retinues, but they appar-

¹ Beaucourt, i. 338, 341.

² When Henry ratified it on Oct. 26 (Rym. x. 155), it was already worthless.

³ Ordonnances, xi. 141; Beaucourt, i. 341, 342 n. They were near Lyons on June 8 (Caillet, *Étude sur les relations de la commune de Lyon avec Charles VII et Louis XI*, 325).

⁴ He crossed with Henry in June, 1421 (Jurade, 604), held a command at the siege of Dreux (see above, pp. 326 sq.), was probably for a time at Meaux (Rym. x. 153 sq.), later stayed for a while at Rouen (ibid. x. 174 sq.; Exch. Accts. 50/13), but was again with Henry in July, 1422 (Rym. x. 227).

⁵ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Oct. 23, 1421; Rym. x. 230.

ently did not stay long¹, and it is clear that the military aid which Henry received from Scotland was negligible. It is true that the Border seems to have been as quiet as it ever was in the fifteenth century; but its defences had of course to be maintained at considerable expense².

Henry had not yet abandoned hope of reaping some fruit of the treaty of Canterbury, and he was in close touch with Sigismund in the summer of 1421 and during the following months. In July, 1421, Walter de la Pole and Dr John Stokes were despatched to conclude an agreement about certain sums which had apparently been lent to the emperor on the security of the duchy of Luxemburg; they were also to discuss the grant to Henry and his heirs by Sigismund of Dauphiné and lands claimed by the Empire in Languedoc³. We do not know the outcome of their mission, which they reported to Henry at Meaux on Nov. 29⁴. Immediately afterwards it was decided to send to Germany a new embassy with the object of securing armed assistance, especially from the Rhenish archbishops and the Wittelsbachs. In the instructions to the envoys, which the king drew up at Meaux and sent to the Council at Westminster for communication to those who were going, they were bidden to emphasise Henry's need of men, though they might add that there was a good prospect of the war ending speedily and consequently of the organisation of a crusade. Elaborate details were given as to the settling of terms; the Count Palatine and the archbishop of Cologne, being already in Henry's pay⁵, were not entitled to expect such high remuneration as the other princes, but the envoys were to have great latitude in bargaining. If possible, they were to obtain gratuitous assistance, but Henry evidently had small hope of that. The troops sent would be given the wages paid by the king to his own subjects, and Henry's representatives were to secure from each of the five potentates concerned one hundred men-at-arms to serve for five months

¹ Rym. x. 153 sq., 158, 174 sq., 204.

² Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Nov. 17, Dec. 1, 1421; *ibid.* 10 Hen. V, Pasch., May 27, June 8, 1422.

³ Rym. x. 144; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., July 15 and 17, 1421.

⁴ For. Accts. 56, F v^o; Exch. Accts. 321/38. Lenz was mistaken in supposing that no embassy was actually sent at this time (p. 212 n.).

⁵ On Dec. 8, 1420, Henry had granted the Count Palatine an annual pension of 1000 marks (D.K.R. xlii. 382; Vita, 293. Cf. Rym. x. 95, 126). For the archbishop of Cologne, see above, p. 32. He was still drawing his 500 marks a year (Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., July 17, 1421; Devon, 368; D.K.R. xlv. 322).

from May 1 next. If they cavilled at the pay offered, they were to be reminded that Castilians and Scots were serving the dauphin in great numbers for twenty or twenty-four francs of "feble Money" a month—a sum not worth more than a good English noble, and it was to be hinted that Henry's friends and allies ought at least to be willing to help him at reasonable wages. In the last resort the envoys were to follow certain secret instructions which Henry was sending sealed with his signet, and if there should be an apparently hopeless deadlock they were not to break off negotiations until they had sent a report to the king and received his reply. After treating with the princes named, the envoys were to go on to the emperor, who, it seems, had given the last embassy to understand that an application from Henry for help would be favourably received. Nothing was apparently to be said to Sigismund about remuneration, for he was bound to aid Henry under the treaty of Canterbury, and (if it could be done without prejudice to the war against the Hussites) he was to be requested to "come and do the King succurse after his many Promesses and often tymes wryting." The envoys might discuss with Sigismund the question of the place of the next General Council, if the emperor raised the matter. They were also to approach the electors not previously interviewed and according to their discretion urge them to send aid to Henry, pleading their obligations under the treaty of Canterbury if necessary¹.

The despatch of the embassy was long delayed, perhaps because of the news from Bohemia, where in January the emperor was ignominiously defeated by Zizka at Kuttenberg, and it was March before all three ambassadors had crossed the sea². The personnel of the mission had been changed³, and we cannot be sure that they were actually given the instructions summarised above, though the terms of their formal commissions suggest that the purpose of the embassy remained unaltered⁴. How Henry's pleas were received we do not know; perhaps he never knew himself, for the envoys did not return to London till towards the end of September⁵. It is certain,

¹ Rym. x. 161 sqq.

² For. Accts. 56, A v^o, D, D v^o; Exch. Accts. 321/39.

³ William Coggeshale was originally one of those selected (Rym. x. 161), but his place was taken by Walter de la Pole (*ibid.* x. 167, 169; For. Accts. 56, D v^o).

⁴ The commissions were dated Jan. 14, 1422 (Rym. x. 169), when the envoys were apparently expected to start shortly (*ibid.* x. 167).

⁵ For. Accts. 56, A v^o, D, D v^o; Exch. Accts. 321/39. The letter from Hartung van Clux, in Rym. x. 208, is shown by Lenz to have been written in 1420.

however, that no serious military aid was secured. Thus, abortive from beginning to end, did the alliance between Henry and Sigismund come to its dissolution. Its sole achievement was to destroy the chances of an adequate reform of the Church through the Council of Constance.

It was probably rather in the hope of safeguarding the duke of Burgundy against embarrassment than in expectation of direct assistance for himself that Henry, in the following August, sent a commission, consisting of the dean of Liège and several Frenchmen, to Malines, where they were to treat for the establishment of friendship with the bishop and inhabitants of Liège and with other lords of the German border¹. Henry was no doubt dead before the envoys completed their errand.

No less fruitless were Henry's efforts to obtain help beyond the Pyrenees. With Aragon he remained at peace², and Castile was too much disturbed by civil strife to excite either apprehension or hope. During the siege of Meaux Henry reopened negotiations with Navarre, and discussed with the king's almoner the terms of an agreement³. But here too nothing substantial seems to have resulted. Portugal remained an ally of Henry, and in January, 1422, Thomas Carew and William Lyndwood were appointed to go thither with the object of securing the speedy despatch of military support⁴. Their mission seems to have been unsuccessful, and in any case they did not return till September⁵.

Henry's diplomacy was not only concerned with foreign countries but also with recalcitrant elements in France itself. Here it did succeed in gaining some success, though little enough in relation to the effort expended. Even nobles attached to the Burgundian cause and towns under the immediate rule of the duke were reluctant to take the oath to observe the treaty of Troyes. The behaviour of the prince of Orange has already been noticed⁶. The duke of Lorraine, whose fiefs in France brought him under the obligation of swearing to the treaty,

¹ Rym. x. 234 sq.

² Trade between England and Aragon still went on (D.K.R. xlv. 636), though it must have been exposed to much interruption.

³ Beaucourt, i. 337, n. 5.

⁴ Rym. x. 168; the envoys left in February (Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 3 and 23, 1422; For. Accts. 56, E).

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ Above, pp. 213, 344 sq.

assumed a similar attitude, and for long avoided meeting Henry on various pretexts¹. On March 25, 1422, he was peremptorily ordered, in the name of Charles VI, to swear that he would accept Henry as king of France after Charles's death²; and, doubtless under pressure from Burgundy and the impression produced by the fall of Meaux, he swore in Philip's presence that he would uphold the cause of Charles, Henry, and the duke, and that after Charles's death he would do his best to suppress rebels in his lands³. This, however, was not the oath required by the treaty or that recently demanded by the French king. Further, the document recording what he had done was attested only by his "secret mark⁴," as he had not brought his seal with him—purposely, one may suspect—and his promise to seal a similar instrument was conditional on his receiving first from Charles and Henry the letters which he ought to have, whatever those might be⁵.

Dijon, where the duke of Lorraine took his oath, had itself been most reluctant to give any pledge to obey the treaty. When Duke Philip went there, in February, 1422, he was accompanied by the chancellor of France and the bishops of Théroutanne and Beauvais, who had been commissioned to receive the oath from the inhabitants. Their chances of success depended entirely on the duke; but Philip had evidently left Henry full of zeal for the Anglo-Burgundian alliance, he put strong pressure on the obstinate mayor and *échevins*, and after a couple of proposed compromises had been rejected by the king's representatives, he commanded them to take the oath in the form required, and smoothed the path of surrender by giving them letters testifying that they did so at his behest⁶.

Tournay, on the other hand, remained obdurate up to Henry's death. Here resistance came from the populace rather than the civic officers, whom Henry seems to have won over in the early summer of 1422. They were so apprehensive of the consequences to themselves that they did not dare to publish an order of Charles VI enjoining the people of Tournay to obey Henry as himself. It was believed that Henry intended to

¹ Beaucourt, i. 326.

² Douët d'Arcq, i. 412 sq.

³ Plancher, iv. p. xx.

⁴ "En signe de verité avons fait plaique nostre signer secreir en marge de ces presentes en absence de nostre seel" (*ibid.*).

⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶ *Ibid.* 44 sq.

besiege the place, but if he had any such plans they were cut short by his death¹.

Henry's diplomacy, however, achieved more in the closing episodes of his varied dealings with Brittany. During the summer of 1421 the relations between the two had remained anomalous. The English persistently treated the truce as still existing², the duke did so on occasion³. As we have seen, however, the duke's brother Richard was serving in the dauphin's army with a large Breton contingent⁴. On the other hand, the bishop of Nantes went in August at the head of a mission to Paris⁵. Arthur of Richemont, moreover, was at first in Normandy on parole, which he steadfastly refused to break⁶, and in August and September, 1421, accompanied at least for a time by the earl of Suffolk, he was in Brittany, sent thither by Henry to persuade the duke to withdraw military support from the dauphin. The duke refused to reply until he had consulted the Estates of the duchy. When they met, it was argued by some that the dauphin had broken the treaty of Sablé by retaining in his service men who had connived at the outrage of the count of Penthievre, but the majority were of the contrary opinion, and the Breton troops were not recalled⁷. They were, however, to some extent neutralised, for Arthur of Richemont himself raised a force of men-at-arms, archers, and crossbowmen for service under Henry⁸, and, as was recorded above, took them to the siege of Meaux⁹. The position of Brittany became more ambiguous than ever. It remained the policy of the English to pretend that the truce continued¹⁰; and the duke still lent himself to the fiction¹¹. At the same time he was trying to attract to Brittany, especially to Rennes, Normans discontented with English rule, large numbers of whom are said to have settled in his territories¹², while the support given by his subjects to hostile enterprises in Normandy and at sea impelled Henry, in

¹ J. J. Smet, *Corpus Chronicorum Flandriae*, iii. 372 sqq. (*Chron. des Pays-Bas, de France, d'Angleterre, et de Tournai*). Cf. Beaucourt, iii. 490, 497.

² D.K.R. xlii. 414.

³ Blanchard, no. 1504.

⁴ See above, pp. 316, 331, n. 3.

⁵ For. Accts. 69, F v^o.

⁶ Bouchart, *Les Grandes Chroniques de Bretagne*, 179 b; *Chron. d'Arthur de Richemont*, 22.

⁷ Morice, *Hist.* i. 487, *Preuves*, ii. 1121, 1123, 1124, 1164; Cosneau, 62; Blanchard, no. 1506; Daumet, 222.

⁸ Rot. Norm. 9 Hen. V, m. 26 d.

⁹ Rym. x. 157 sq.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 153; D.K.R. xlii. 631.

¹¹ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 444.

¹² Blanchard, no. 1518; Bouchart, 181.

the autumn of 1421, to arrest the ships and goods of Bretons in many English ports and to forbid trade between Brittany and Normandy¹. English agents, however, had remained with the duke after Arthur of Richemont's departure², and in the end their influence seems to have prevailed. At all events, in April, 1422, the duke announced that he wished to come in person, or at least to send a deputation, to Henry in the cause of peace. The necessary safe-conducts were granted³, but whether the embassy was sent does not appear. At the beginning of June, however, matters had advanced further, for on the 9th safe-conducts were issued for commissioners whom the duke was sending to swear to the treaty of Troyes, though their validity was conditional on his promising to take the oath in person afterwards⁴. The business nevertheless made slow progress, for the duke's letters empowering his representatives to swear on his behalf were not actually drawn up till June 26. He was careful to state that he was acting with the advice of the notable men of the duchy, and record was made of the ecclesiastics, nobles, and officials who had given their consent⁵. The mission, headed by the bishops of Nantes and Vannes, arrived in Paris on July 27⁶, but they drove a hard bargain with the royal government, and it was not until after Henry's death that the oath was formally taken, in return for a substantial grant of land to the duke and a promise to aid him against his enemies and to punish Olivier de Blois⁷. Still, Henry had detached Brittany from its alliance with the dauphin.

Nothing illustrates better Henry's superiority as a strategist over Edward III and the Black Prince than his refusal to dissipate his strength by undertaking big operations in Aquitaine. Whatever changes occurred there, whether through diplomacy or through force, had no more than local importance, and there is no need to describe them in detail. Little of note happened during 1419. The great lords of the south-west, determined to keep their lands in any event, continued to sit on the fence. The count of Foix, after being invested with the government of Languedoc by both French parties⁸, recovered

¹ Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 12; D.K.R. xliv. 631; Bréquigny, 230, 254.

² Morice, Hist. i. 487.

³ Rym. x. 206 sqq.

⁴ Ibid. 220 sq.

⁵ Morice, Preuves, ii. 1112 sq.

⁶ Fauquembergue, ii. 54 sq.

⁷ Morice, Preuves, ii. 1119, 1120.

⁸ Flourac, 72, 74, 77, 244 sq.; Vaissète, ix. 1048; Beaucourt, i. 374.

nearly the whole of it for the dauphin¹, but after the tragedy of Montereau, where his brother Archambaud was killed, he was won over to the Burgundian cause, the dauphin consequently revoking his commission when he visited the south early in 1420². From then till 1422 he was friendly with both Burgundians and English³, though very cautious in his dealings with them. One of his brothers, the captal de Buch, was, as we have seen, serving Henry zealously in Normandy; while the other, Mathieu, count of Comminges in right of his wife, was beginning to waver in his devotion to the dauphin in 1420, and ranged himself with the Burgundian party⁴. Henry's truce with the count of Armagnac and the lord of Albret had been prolonged to June 24, 1419⁵, and even after its expiration the two lords gave no trouble.

There was, however, a certain amount of fighting in south-western France, some of it in Saintonge, some in the neighbourhood of Bayonne. The men of Saintonge were not willing to go far afield in the dauphin's cause, but, the English having taken Mortagne, a good deal of zeal was devoted to its recovery. The operations, first directed by the lord of Pons and afterwards by the count of Vertus, the dauphin's lieutenant in Saintonge, ended in the capture of the place by escalade on the night of Dec. 20, 1419⁶. Meanwhile, the inhabitants of Bayonne were in great alarm at the active intervention of Castile on the Armagnac side. Documents captured by one of their ships betrayed the Castilian plans for transporting Scottish troops to France and besieging Bayonne⁷. A few weeks later, in September, 1419, they wrote to Henry begging for aid against the Castilians, who had entered the country in great force and laid waste the land from Fuenterrabia to the very gates of the city. It was believed in Bayonne that the whole military force of both Castile and Aragon was shortly to be directed against them⁸; but such fears were of course fantastic, and the mutual jealousies of the two Spanish kingdoms, together with domestic strife in Castile, prevented the achievement of anything permanently important.

¹ Flourac, 78 sqq.

² *Ibid.* 81 sqq.

³ *Ibid.* 83.

⁴ Beaucourt, i. 374.

⁵ *Rym.* ix. 690, 695.

⁶ Aussy, *Registres*, iii. 271, 273, 274, 275, 297, 298, 299, Saintonge, 30. In the later work Aussy misdates the recapture of Mortagne with that contempt for chronology which is the bane of the local historians of France.

⁷ *Rym.* ix. 783 sq.

⁸ *Ibid.* ix. 794 sq.

It was perhaps the news of the activities of the Castilians that moved Henry to show a little more concern than usual for his interests in Aquitaine. It was time that something was done. Even those regions where English authority was paramount were in evil plight. The coasts were exposed to the raids of French privateers¹. There were recurring pestilences and famines in most districts². For long, the archbishop of Bordeaux, so far from being able to visit his province, was constrained to neglect his own diocese³. At so important a place as St Émilion both church and fortifications were ruinous⁴. Henry, indeed, did not intend to do much himself, but in the autumn of 1419 he wrote to the prelates, nobles, and towns of Guienne, ordering them to attend a meeting of the Estates which he was instructing the mayor and the constable of Bordeaux to summon⁵. These officers were charged to ask for a *fouage* at least, and for more if the captal de Buch, who was sent at the same time, thought it advisable⁶. Probably, too, the king gave orders for the initiation of a campaign for the recovery of such parts of the duchy as were in French hands. In the following April, at any rate, La Réole, Puynormand, Malengin, and Lamothe-Montravel had been attacked, and Bordeaux had sent troops and its big bombard to assist in the operations⁷. Some of the men of Bordeaux, however, had shirked service⁸, and when on April 11, 1420, the summons to the meeting of the Estates was read to the *jurats* and they were told that the lieutenant-seneschal had chosen Dax as the place and the first Sunday in May as the time, the news evidently roused misgivings. The risks of the journey were admittedly great, and the purpose of the assembly had not been disclosed. The people were reluctant to give their delegates power to consent to taxation, but in the end it was decided that they should have authority to accept anything demanded by the king, provided

¹ Denifle, *Désolation*, i. 538 sq.

² Gras, ii. 115; Denifle, *Désolation*, i. 135, 200.

³ *Ibid.* 128.

⁴ *Ibid.* 142; Gras, iii. 282.

⁵ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 263, 264 sq.; Jurade, 363 sq. The letters were dated at Gisors, Sept. 26. On the Estates of Guienne, see Lodge, *Gascony*, 146 sq.

⁶ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 265 sq., 267 sq.

⁷ Jurade, 362, 363, 366. Puynormand and Malengin are in dep. Gironde, arr. Libourne, cant. Lussac; Lamothe-Montravel is in dep. Dordogne, arr. Bergerac, cant. Vélines.

⁸ Jurade, 366.

that nothing done should create a precedent or cause prejudice to the rights of the city. The provost and two others were chosen to go¹.

The "parlament," as it is repeatedly called in the records of the Bordeaux *jurats*², met on May 17. John Radcliffe, constable of Bordeaux, speaking on behalf of Henry, expressed the king's regret that he could not personally undertake military operations in Guienne, but asserted his intention of making war there until he had recovered the whole duchy. This would also have the good effect of preventing the French of the southwest from helping those elsewhere. He therefore asked the Estates to grant a *fouage* of a gold noble on each "hearth," adding that the whole would be spent on operations in Guienne³.

The Estates retired to deliberate in the refectory of the Friars Minor; but when all were ready to begin, the deputies from the Landes declared that they must debate separately from those of the Bordelais, and notwithstanding remonstrances from the archbishop of Bordeaux, withdrew. Left to themselves, the representatives of the Bordelais drew up a reply to the constable, which was communicated by the archbishop, four lords, and the deputies of Bordeaux, Libourne, St Émilion, and Bourg. They said that a number of lords and clergy, and the towns of Clairac⁴ and Castillonès⁵ had not been summoned, though they should have been, and that in consequence those present could give no definite answer to the king's request, seeing that what touches all should be approved of all. When all those named in the list which they presented had been summoned, they would be pleased to give a reply after due consideration. With this the proceedings evidently ended. What was said by the deputies of the Landes is not recorded⁶.

It looks as if the king's officers regarded the message of the representatives of the Bordelais as a polite refusal to do any-

¹ Jurade, 363, 364, 369 sqq., 376, 377.

² Ibid. 373, 377, 379.

³ Ibid. 380 sq.

⁴ Dep. Lot-et-Garonne, arr. Marmande, cant. Tonneins.

⁵ Dep. Lot-et-Garonne, arr. Villeneuve-sur-Lot, chef-lieu of canton.

⁶ Jurade, 381 sqq. The editor of these most valuable records thinks that the list of those not summoned enables us to determine the extent of English authority at this time. But, first, it is admittedly not exhaustive (ibid. 382); secondly, places far beyond the sphere of effective English jurisdiction, and places in the very heart of the area where English rule was loyally accepted, are mixed up indiscriminately. The king's officers had apparently issued their summons in an haphazard way.

thing. At Bordeaux, nevertheless, the civic authorities were for the most part loyal enough. They tried to prevent trade with the king's enemies, and discussed measures against disloyal agitators¹. To compensate in some measure for the failure of the assembly at Dax, they resolved to raise one hundred men-at-arms to fight the French and to pay them for three months². Meanwhile, the places besieged in the early spring having fallen, the civic militia had been taking part in the siege of Rions, which had been French since 1408, and with the formidable artillery of the city also lending its aid, the town was reduced by the middle of July, 1420³. By agreement with the constable it remained in possession of the civic authorities of Bordeaux⁴. The men and artillery of the city were forthwith sent to St Macaire, which was carried by assault on Aug. 15⁵.

The seneschal of Aquitaine, John Tiptoft, had accompanied the king to Normandy, and, as we have seen, had been president of the *Scaccarium* and treasurer-general of that duchy, besides rendering useful service in diplomacy. Henry's increasing interest in Gascony was indicated by his despatch of Tiptoft thither in the spring of this year. This had been resolved upon in May, when shipping for his transport was commandeered in Bristol and neighbouring ports⁶, but he did not sail till after June 18⁷. It was declared that the king's officers in the duchy of Aquitaine were to be paid before any others, and that Tiptoft's arrears of pay were to be cleared off in a way satisfactory to him⁸. He took with him sixty men-at-arms, 300 archers⁹, and a considerable quantity of grain and forage¹⁰. On Aug. 23, 1420, he landed at Bordeaux¹¹. With him came the mayor, John St John, who, with one of the citizens, had been on a mission to Henry¹².

In addition to his administrative and military duties, Tiptoft had been empowered by the king to adjudicate in a bitter dispute which had been waged for more than a year between the civic authorities and the archbishop¹³. The question at issue,

¹ Jurade, 378, 386, 389.

² Ibid. 388, 393, 394 sq., 396.

³ Ibid. 398, 401, 407, 423, 480; Drouyn, i. 138 sq.

⁴ Jurade, 426.

⁵ Ibid. 401, 434, 435, 444.

⁶ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 278, 319, 320.

⁷ Ibid. 324, where the date is wrongly given.

⁸ Rym. ix. 915.

⁹ Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 4602, p. 227.

¹⁰ Chanc. Warr., Ser. 1, 667/938.

¹¹ Jurade, 438.

¹² Ibid. 386, 438 sqq.

¹³ Ibid. 443.

as was usual in such cases, was the frontier between ecclesiastical and secular jurisdiction¹. Anti-clerical feeling evidently ran high in Bordeaux, and the *jurats* had sought to counter the support which the archbishop received from the pope by putting the matter before the king². The quarrel apparently caused more concern in Bordeaux than the war, and it still had a long course to run. But it may most conveniently be treated in connection with Henry's general attitude towards the pope.

As for the recovery of Gascony, Tiptoft's arrival seems in no way to have promoted it. He soon talked of laying siege to Budos, and Bordeaux placed its military resources at his service³; but if any operations were attempted before the end of the year, they were not successful. The autumn, indeed, was depressing. There was much sickness in the city⁴, and the French were aggressive. At the beginning of November the mayor of Bourc sent word that his town was threatened by the dauphin, who was at Pons with a large force. Evidently this was not believed, for he was told that Bordeaux had no artillery to spare and had to content himself with twenty-five pounds of gunpowder⁵. A little later, however, the Bordeaux authorities, perhaps alarmed by the arrival at Rochefort of galleys from Castile, were in apprehension of an attack on the city by both sea and land, though their fears proved to be groundless⁶.

In 1421 Gascony witnessed much warlike activity but few important changes. In March a truce was signed with the dauphinists at Budos and Bazas⁷, but long before midsummer, when it expired, preparations for the siege of the former were being made⁸. Bordeaux sent a contingent, with the city's big gun and two smaller pieces, and before June 29 André de Budos, who was in command of the defence, began to parley with Menaut de Fabas, captain of the Bordeaux troops. His terms, which were somewhat insolent, were rejected by the seneschal, and the siege was pressed to a successful issue by the middle of July⁹. The zeal of Bordeaux had strained its resources, and the civic government had to raise a loan to cover

¹ Jurade, 430, 440.

³ Ibid. 449, 452.

⁵ Ibid. 463.

⁶ Ibid. 469, 472; Aussy, *Registres*, iii. 307 sq.

⁷ Jurade, 494.

⁹ Ibid. 519, 520, 521, 522 sqq., 549.

² Ibid. 387, 427, 431, 439.

⁴ Ibid. 460.

⁸ Ibid. 505, 507, 519.

military expenses¹. At this time grain was so dear that Henry was asked to permit its importation from England².

In August the seneschal asked for the use of the big gun against La Marque, the siege of which was in progress a month later, when it was agreed that the gun should be lent³. Bordeaux still had men on active service, and in October sent supplies to Menaut de Fabas, stipulating that he should hold the frontier and make unremitting war on the garrison of Bazas⁴. The military activity of the English and their supporters evidently caused concern to the French, even in regions which were not directly threatened, for when the dauphin summoned the towns of his territories to send their contingents to Vendôme in August, 1421, St Jean d'Angély begged for exemption, lest the town should be left to the mercy of its enemies⁵. There might have been better ground for this alarm after Nov. 5, when two letters from Henry reached Bordeaux. In the first of these he thanks the mayor and *jurats* for their loyalty, and urges them to wage continual war against Poitou, Saintonge, and other dauphinist regions, under the direction of the captal de Buch and the seneschal⁶. A few days later, in response to this appeal, the civic authorities resolved to maintain forty men-at-arms and eighty archers in the king's service⁷. About a month

¹ Jurade, 526, 624 sq.

² Ibid. 549.

³ Ibid. 550, 564. The city had great confidence in artillery and was evidently proud of its guns but it is not easy to discover from the scattered references in the records what its resources in artillery were. Besides siege-engines of the old type—mangonels, trebuchets, and such-like—it possessed a large bombard and one or two smaller cannon in the spring of 1420 (ibid. 363, 366, 386, 401). In the summer of that year a big gun, capable of firing a stone of seven hundredweight, was being made; it was apparently used for the first time at the siege of Budos (ibid. 426, 520). Smaller cannon were also bought from private manufacturers (ibid. 507, 546); two of these lighter pieces were employed at Budos (ibid. 520). Meanwhile the city's master of the ordnance had been commissioned to make another big gun, which could throw shot of five hundredweight (ibid. 478). The completion of this was long delayed, and it was still unfinished in March, 1422, when the records of the *jurade* fail us (ibid. 553, 565, 589, 600, 613).

⁴ Ibid. 570.

⁵ Aussy, Reg. iii. 328, 329 sq.

⁶ Jurade, 573. The second letter ordered the authorities to settle accounts with the mayor (ibid. 573 sq.). The dating of these letters furnishes a horrible warning to the historical investigator. The first is dated, "souz nostre prive seel, a nostre paleys de Westmonstier, le quint jour de juyn." Nevertheless, it asserts that the king had already arrived at Calais (cf. above, p. 318). It confounds confusion by adding: "Et, pour ce que nous croions que de ce puries estre plustost certifiez de nostre royaume d'Angleterra que de les costes ou nous suymes, si avons fait cestes nos lettras (*sic*), desouz nostre prive seel, en nostredit (*sic*) roiaume esteant." The second letter, also under the privy seal, was dated at Dover, June 18. It is with great reluctance that I assure the reader that on June 5 Henry was not at Westminster and had not yet reached Calais, and that on the 18th he was not at Dover. There could not be a better illustration of the danger of using the dates of privy seal documents as evidence of the king's movements (cf. Maxwell-Lyte, 63-72, 80).

⁷ Jurade, 578.

later another letter from Henry thanked the people of Bordeaux for their share in the recent fighting, exhorted them to do yet more in future, and asked for frequent information about the enemy¹. Accordingly, when in January, 1422, it was rumoured that the dauphin was at hand and had declared that he would presently attack Bordeaux, a balinger was despatched to convey the news, though the populace seems not to have believed it². The citizens, however, were concerned about the condition and prospects of Gascony, and wished to discuss with the people of the Landes, Bayonne, Dax, and St Sever the advisability of sending a deputation to lay their views before the king. The king's Council and the nobles were in favour of the proposal, and nominated two members of the projected mission, inviting Bordeaux to appoint a third, and suggesting that Bordeaux, St Émilion, Libourne and Bourg should furnish one-third of the expenses, the Church and the barons supplying the rest³. The city government, however, eventually decided that the cost of the deputation would be too great⁴, but in March sent the mayor and the town clerk to Henry⁵, a course probably more expensive than the one rejected. Meanwhile further letters from Henry had promised his support against the archbishop, given a long report of his last campaign, and once more urged an offensive in Saintonge and Poitou⁶. The citizens were apparently ready to comply⁷, but what they did we do not know, for shortly afterwards the records of the *jurade* fail, and there is no available evidence as to the course of the war in the south-west of France for what little of Henry's reign was left. The captal de Buch had planned to besiege Montguyon, and had secured the loan of the famous big gun and two smaller ones⁸. The outcome is not known, but an active policy on the part of the English was apparently expected, for in the spring the count of Armagnac had a force for the defence of the frontier of Guienne against them⁹. Nothing very startling can have occurred, for when Henry died, Bazas and St Bazeille

¹ Dated Bonvilliers, July 21 (*Jurade*, 586).

² *Ibid.* 597.

⁴ *Ibid.* 603.

⁶ *Ibid.* 603 sqq., 609 sq.

⁸ *Ibid.* 602, 603. Montguyon is in dep. Charente-Inf., arr. Jonzac.

⁹ *Bibl. nat.*, MS. franç. 26,044, nos. 5708, 5729. The count's brother Bernard was the dauphin's lieutenant-general in Saintonge, Angoumois, and the Limousin during the latter part of 1421 (*Aussy*, Reg. iii. 329 sq.).

³ *Ibid.* 597, 602.

⁵ *Ibid.* 607 sqq., 618.

⁷ *Ibid.* 610 sqq.

were still hostile to the English, neither being reduced till 1424¹. The operations of the last two years, though distinctly favourable to the English, had not materially changed the situation, and the area in Aquitaine over which their rule was effective remained very narrow.

But if arms achieved little in Aquitaine, diplomacy accomplished still less. Henry was evidently willing to make great concessions to the nobles of that region. Shortly before the treaty of Troyes was signed, he authorised the *capit de Buch* to offer his brother, the count of Foix, the choice of the office of constable of France or the governorship of Languedoc as the price of his support of the Anglo-Burgundian alliance². On July 1, 1420, he granted the viscounty of Narbonne, with other lands in Languedoc, to Mathieu de Foix, count of Comminges³. The English military successes of 1420 probably account for the fact that at Rouen, in the following January, envoys from the lord of Albret and his cousin Francis, lord of St Bazeille⁴, undertook that these lords should do homage to Henry as duke of Aquitaine and swear to obey the treaty of Troyes, while there was to be a mutual restoration of property and, on Henry's part, the grant of an amnesty for misdeeds arising out of disputes that had originated in the famous appeal against the Black Prince more than fifty years before⁵. But the two lords failed to ratify the treaty, and it was only after much difficulty that the English authorities in Gascony concluded a mere truce with the lord of Albret later in the year⁶.

During Henry's stay at Rouen there were also present two agents of Jean de Grailly, count of Foix, who were officially described as having been sent to expose his affection for the treaty of Troyes and his desire to serve Charles VI and Henry. The conclusion of an agreement was, however, frustrated by the question of homage for Béarn, which Henry claimed as due to him, and all that could be decided was that the difference should be settled by negotiation and not by force⁷.

¹ Baurein, *Variétés Bordeloises*, iv. 291; Gironde, xvi. 102 sq.

² Flourac, 83 sq.

³ Gironde, xvi. 36 sq.; cf. D.K.R. xlv. 320.

⁴ Appointed on Sept. 25, 1420 (*ibid.*).

⁵ Rym. x. 41 sqq. When Henry (*ibid.* x. 45) spoke of the two lords as having done homage and accepted the treaty of Troyes, he was plainly ascribing to them the action of their representatives.

⁶ Jurade, 491, 494, 556, 558.

⁷ Rym. x. 46. These negotiations are misdated by Flourac (84).

In the autumn of 1421 negotiations were resumed¹, Henry having in the meantime renewed his offer of the previous year²; they were conducted before Meaux during the winter; and an agreement was signed at St Faro on March 3. When the count had personally taken the oath under the treaty of Troyes, he was to be invested with the government of Languedoc and the county of Bigorre, together with other lands claimed by him as his own. He was to receive money sufficient to pay 1500 soldiers, and for himself and the nobles of his retinue he should have 750 gold crowns a month. He was to begin military operations against the dauphin before June 1³. Formal commissions to the count as governor of Languedoc and Bigorre were forthwith made out⁴, and the French Treasury was ordered to provide for the regular payment of the sums fixed in the agreement⁵, with the exception of 2750 crowns, which, it was stipulated, were to be paid in England⁶. Thither, accordingly, the count's representatives betook themselves, the money being delivered to them at Southampton on April 21⁷. They were taken back to Gascony in one of the king's ships⁸, and reached the count on May 29 at Mont-de-Marsan. He then declared that they had in certain respects exceeded their instructions. After discussion with his brother, the captal, and other commissioners sent by Henry to receive the oath to the treaty, he announced that he would take it when the agreement had been subjected to various amendments⁹. The truth was that he had been listening to overtures from the dauphin¹⁰. Before further steps could be taken Henry died. The count seems to have kept the money brought by his envoys from Southampton, and up to Henry's death this was the sole tangible result of the elaborate negotiations, evidently regarded by the king as of great moment, the records and instruments of which fill many pages of Rymer's *Fœdera*.

¹ The Norman Rolls for 8 Hen. V contain a writ, dated March 8, ordering the seneschal of Guienne to aid the count of Foix, who had been entrusted with the reduction of Languedoc and Bigorre (Rym. x. 70; D.K.R. xlii. 402). There can be no doubt, however, that this document ought to have been enrolled under the following year.

² Flourac, 84.

³ Rym. x. 177 sqq.

⁴ Ibid. 181 sqq.

⁵ Ibid. 192 sq.

⁶ Ibid. 195.

⁷ Ibid. 204 sqq.; Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., April 20, May 28, 1422.

⁸ Ibid. April 20, 1422.

⁹ Rym. x. 230 sqq.; Gironde, xvi. 27, 29, 30, 32; Vic and Vaissète, ix. 1071.

¹⁰ Flourac, 87.

Although Henry left no stone unturned in his efforts to secure help in prosecuting the war, he seems to have been oppressed by the magnitude of the task that faced him. It would be interesting to know his private views as to the possibility of giving full effect to the treaty of Troyes. Probably, when it was signed, he hoped that it would be generally accepted by Frenchmen, and that the dauphinist party, though it would doubtless resist, would be too weak to hold out for long. The campaign of 1420 must have opened his eyes, and as we have seen, he evidently realised when he went to England in 1421 that a hard struggle lay before him in France¹. Since his return he had materially improved the situation of the Anglo-Burgundian party; but he had achieved nothing decisive; and, while it is true that in conquering Meaux he conquered many other places, he must have recognised that if all such success was to cost such effort, his resources would fail long before the dauphinists were subdued. We may well believe, therefore, that he began to incline towards compromise with the enemy. After all, the treaty of Troyes placed him in a very strong position, and he might confidently expect to secure such terms as no Englishman would have dreamt of three years before.

There is consequently nothing incredible in the story that Henry confided to the duke of Burgundy and a few of his councillors—presumably at the siege of Meaux in January, 1422—that he desired to treat for peace with the dauphinists and hoped that, at the instance of Burgundy, the duke of Savoy would make the first approaches². The two dukes had an interview at Geneva, which Philip reached on March 29 and left on April 4³. It appears that the duke of Savoy agreed to send envoys to France with a view to mediation, and they passed through Lyons on May 17⁴. What followed is not known, but the attempt probably broke down very soon.

It was of course to the papacy that men generally looked for mediation between combatants, and Henry's preference for

¹ See above, pp. 272 sq.

² Beaucourt, i. 339, ii. 520 sq., citing *Collection de Bourgogne*, 99, pp. 422-428, 442, which contain instructions of Duke Philip to envoys at the time of the Congress of Arras of 1435. In the Burgundian document, printed by La Barre (i. 342), accusing the English of breaking the treaty of Troyes, it is said that Henry V "eust ouvert en son vivant la voye de ladite Paix generale, et en eust bone volenté de la poursuir."

³ Plancher, iv. 49, 50.

⁴ Beaucourt, i. 339.

the duke of Savoy was no doubt due to the ill-concealed unfriendliness of Martin V towards the English. The pope was becoming more insistent in his demand for the repeal or modification of the Statute of Provisors. In June, 1421, after renewed representations from Martin on the matter, together, it seems, with advice about ending the war, Simon de Teramo, the papal collector in England, was requested by Henry to go to Rome and communicate his reply¹. Henry assured the pope of the devotion of himself and his English realm to the apostolic see, and claimed that he had always striven to maintain his conquests in their accustomed obedience to the papacy². As for the offensive statute, it had not, he repeated, been made by him, but by his predecessors with the consent of the Three Estates, without whose concurrence it could not reasonably be repealed. He had never undertaken to raise the question in the recent parliament, and indeed pressure of urgent public business rendered its discussion impossible. He now, however, offered to consider in the first parliament held after his return to England (which he hoped would not be long delayed) whether the statute could reasonably be maintained. Had the matter been brought up when there was no time to settle it, those hostile to the papacy would have been forewarned and the pope's interests prejudiced³. Henry's explanations were perhaps a little too plausible; after all, he might have frustrated the anti-papal legislation by neglecting to enforce it, as previous kings had done, instead of being the first to execute it strictly; and it is not surprising that he failed to convince the pope of his sincerity. In a reply dated Oct. 19, Martin again enlarged on the wickedness of the anti-papal measures and the disgrace that must attach to any country where they were applied⁴. What Simon de Teramo had been told to say about peace we

¹ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Pasch., July 17, 1421; *ibid.* Mich., March 19, 1422; Raynaldus, viii. 538 sq. In the same month an embassy from Charles VI and Henry was already at the curia, but its business is uncertain (Morosini, ii. 224 n.).

² So far as we can tell, this claim was justified. It was by the Armagnacs that the Liberties of the Gallican Church were upheld; the Burgundians had formally accepted the restored authority of the papacy and declared themselves content with the concessions made by Martin V in his concordat with the French near the close of the Council of Constance (Valois, iv. 418). What little we hear of Henry's attitude towards the papacy in the capacity of regent of France indicates that he acquiesced in this policy (Fauquembergue, i. 385 sq., ii. 5 sqq., 34 sq., 40 sqq., 52: to understand the significance of these passages one must remember that the *Parlement* was in favour of maintaining the Liberties).

³ Cotton MS., Cleop. E. ii. f. 353 b sq.

⁴ Raynaldus, viii. 538 sq.

do not know, but Henry can hardly have shown much desire for it, since in another letter, apparently written about the same time, Martin exhorts him to turn his mind to it, lectures him verbosely on the mutability of fortune, and reminds him that the continuance of the war in France delays the extirpation of heresy in Bohemia. He must receive with readiness the pope's counsels and listen attentively to the bishop of Bologna, whose wisdom and purity have led the pope to choose him to go to France in the cause of peace¹. The pope also wrote to the dauphin, commending peace and commiserating him in his misfortunes. This letter is more friendly in tone than the one addressed to Henry².

No doubt the dispute between the archbishop and the city of Bordeaux increased the tension between king and pope. The arbitration of John Tiptoft, after some vacillation on the part of the archbishop, had brought about an agreement on the basis of the *status quo ante*³. In May, 1421, this was supplemented by a settlement of some outstanding points⁴. The quarrel might have ended there, had not the pope meanwhile rejected the former agreement as showing insufficient regard for the rights of the Church⁵. The *jurats* in office at the beginning of the dispute still lay under sentence of excommunication, and those of the current year were now declared to have incurred the same fate⁶. Both pope and *jurats* had sought the assistance of Henry⁷. Hitherto he seems to have contented himself with efforts to mediate, but in the summer of 1421, evidently annoyed by Martin's intransigence, he began to throw his weight on the side of the city⁸, and in the autumn instructed his agents and friends at the curia to forward its cause by all means in their power⁹. A further appeal from the city was followed by the summons of the archbishop to the king. He set out in March, 1422¹⁰.

Just at this unpropitious moment, there was on his way to Henry Urban de Florencia, of the Carthusian house of Santa

¹ Raynaldus, viii. 539.

² *Ibid.* 540.

³ Cal. Papal Lett. vii. 9; Jurade, 453 sqq.

⁴ *Ibid.* 512, 513, 516.

⁵ Cal. Papal Lett. vii. 9; Jurade, 516 sqq.

⁶ *Ibid.* 440, 456, 526 sq., 528 sq., 548 sq.

⁷ *Ibid.* 427, et passim; Cal. Papal Lett. vii. 9.

⁸ Jurade, 567.

⁹ *Ibid.* 601, 603 sq.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* 608, 610.

Croce in Rome, whom the king had expressed a wish to meet, and who was entrusted by the pope with business which presumably had to do with the repeal of anti-papal laws and the conclusion of peace in France¹. Of Urban's doings no more seems to be known; but little can have come of them. He was closely followed by Nicholas Albergati, bishop of Bologna, who on Feb. 9, 1422, was commissioned to visit Henry, the dauphin, and the duke of Burgundy, with a view to making peace. Though furnished with elaborate instructions, he was to be guided largely by his discretion². This must have been subjected to a speedy test, for about the time of his departure, March 26, Martin received from the dauphin a complaint about papal encroachments on his rights; and though the pope wrote protesting his innocence and his affection for the dauphin³, the bishop can hardly have found a very friendly atmosphere at his court. But what happened there we do not know. In July Albergati had reached the second stage of his task and was at Senlis⁴. If the humanist Poggio, then in England, is to be believed, his sanctity and single-mindedness made a most favourable impression on the English king and his counsellors⁵; and another contemporary states that he had framed conditions of peace which had some chance of acceptance, when the deaths of Henry and Charles VI threw everything into confusion⁶. He travelled about in France till the summer of 1423⁷, but passions ran too high for him to accomplish anything.

When Henry was dead, his non-committal promises about the Statute of Provisors became increasingly definite in papal letters to his son's Council. Soon after the beginning of the new reign, Martin alleged that he had promised to call a parliament immediately on returning from France and to take measures at it for the restoration of the Church's liberty⁸. By 1435 he had resolved to give the pope full power over all benefices, and only death could have frustrated the performance of this laudable intention⁹.

¹ Cal. Papal Lett. vii. 9.

² Acta Sanctorum, II, die nona maij, p. 479; Raynaldus, viii. 540.

³ Acta Sanct., loc. cit.; Beaucourt, i. 330; cf. Cal. Papal Lett. vii. 9.

⁴ Beaucourt, i. 331; cf. Douët d'Arcq, Comptes, 284.

⁵ Acta Sanct. II, die ix maij, p. 471.

⁶ Ibid. 470, 480.

⁷ Ibid. 470, 480.

⁸ Raynaldus, viii. 557.

⁹ Ibid. ix. 199 sq. (Eugenius IV to Henry VI). For the agreement said to have been made between Henry and the pope about the possessions of alien priories, see above, i. 341 sq.

CHAPTER LXXIII

THE REGENT OF FRANCE

IT must not be forgotten that Henry was regent of France. The territory over which his authority could make itself felt was of course small. Normandy and the "conquest" were administered as a separate state. Until just before his death, Brittany was at best an unfriendly neutral. The duke of Burgundy had of course to be treated as an ally rather than a subject. Beyond the Loire the country was almost solidly dauphinist. North of it, Vendôme and Anjou were entirely and Maine was mostly in dauphinist hands. Perche and the Chartrain still contained a number of dauphinist strongholds, such as Châteaudun, Senonches, Nogent-le-Roi (taken by Henry in August, 1421, but evidently lost again), Rambouillet, and Auneau¹; while in some parts of the royal domain, even though the population might have accepted the treaty of Troyes, the military activities of the dauphinists made effective administration impossible. Thus, as we have seen, Picardy, the northern parts of the Île-de-France, and a great part of Champagne were the scenes of constant fighting, amid which the civil authorities were powerless. Between the treaty of Troyes and Henry's death, there are records of appointments of *baillis* in the *bailliages* of Amiens², Vermandois³, Valois⁴, Senlis⁵, Meaux⁶, Melun⁷, Sens⁸, Troyes⁹, and Chartres¹⁰—a list which probably gives a somewhat too favourable impression of the extent of Henry's authority¹¹. Normandy apart, his position was not unlike that of a French king of the twelfth century.

¹ Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044/5740; for Senonches, cf. Registres et Minutes du comté de Dunois, 15.

² Fauquembergue, i. 391; Fenin, 190.

³ Fauquembergue, i. 391.

⁴ Ibid. ii. 52.

⁵ Ibid. ii. 27.

⁶ Ibid. i. 391.

⁷ Ibid. i. 390, ii. 25 sq.

⁸ Ibid. ii. 38.

⁹ Boutiot, ii. 439.

¹⁰ Fauquembergue, ii. 1.

¹¹ All these *bailliages*, with the exception of Melun, were the scene of much fighting. Meaux remained in dauphinist hands for more than fourteen months after Henry had made an appointment to the *bailliage* of which it was the centre, while the *bailliage* of Chartres, as we have seen, was overrun by the dauphinists for some weeks in the early summer of 1421. In 1422 judges were established at Beauvais to deal with cases which ought properly to have been tried at Senlis, because of the risks of travel between the two places (Flammermont, 233).

Except for a few weeks in the winter of 1420-1421, Henry was engaged in military operations during the whole of the time which he spent in France after the signing of the treaty of Troyes. He had thus little leisure for reforming the French system of government—not that there is any reason to suppose that he desired to alter much. Such changes as he made all had to do with finance. Within a few weeks of the conclusion of the treaty, he was trying to reduce the waste and extravagance which marked the administration of the public revenues. This had for some time been under a single direction¹; but in the actual receipt and disbursement of the money, the time-honoured distinction between *domaine* and *aides*, or ordinary and extraordinary revenue, still caused a wasteful duplication of officials². Henry began, on July 15, 1420, by dismissing two of the four commissioners of finance, Guillaume le Clerc and Jean de Précy being suffered to remain in office³. On Sept. 9, however, a much more drastic measure was taken. The two commissioners were discharged, accompanied by the *changeur* of the Treasury, the two *clerks au Trésor*, and the receiver-general and controller of the “extraordinary” revenues; all revenue, it was ordained, should be paid into the hands of a single official at the Treasury, without undergoing any deduction for the needs of the locality where it had been collected; this same functionary should make disbursements in pursuance of orders from the king or his commissioner; and the *clerc du Trésor* should keep the account of all receipts and payments, and render it to the *Chambre des Comptes* at the accustomed times⁴. The changes thus introduced not only made for economy, but brought under Henry’s control all the available revenue of the crown, much of which had hitherto failed to

¹ Continuously since 1418 (Borrelli de Serres, iii. 136 sq.). It was under commissioners appointed to act as “gouverneurs généraux tant du domaine que des aides, monnaies et autres finances.” Viollet’s belief (Institutions, iii. 424, n. 3, 492, n. 4) that this unified control, after having been unsuccessfully prescribed by the *Ordonnance cabochienne*, was introduced by Henry, is based on a singular misreading of a document which in any case had to do with Normandy alone.

² Borrelli de Serres, iii. 160 sq. On the meaning of the term *aides*, cf. Dupont-Ferrier, in Bibl. Éc. Chartes, lxxxix. ³ Ordonnances, xi. 95.

⁴ Ibid. 103 sq. The importance attached to this ordinance is indicated by the solemnity of the preamble: “Comme . . . Nous ayons nagueres fait advisier sur le fait et gouvernement de nos finances, et ayons este advertiz que . . . pour l’excèsif nombre et grant multiplication d’Officiers . . . et aussi par les moyens soubtiles, tant par moyens de decharges comme autres . . . icelles noz finances sont venues a telle diminution que . . . noz faiz et affaires sont demourez . . . sans aucune execution, dont a peine notre Seigneu ie est venue presque a totale destruction . . .”

reach the Treasury owing to ill-considered assignments. The duty of receiving and disbursing the money was apparently assigned to the *changeur*, who had for some time performed these functions in the case of "ordinary" revenue. A certain André d'Épernon was selected for the office, which he held until Henry's death¹. There was still a *clerc du Trésor*; but no new *clercs au Trésor*, receiver-general, or controller seem to have been appointed as long as Henry was regent². As for the *gouverneurs des finances*, Guillaume le Clerc, though deprived of the title, carried on their work until January, when Précý was restored to his position, with Pierre d'Orgemont as colleague³. These were replaced in the following September by Louis of Luxemburg, bishop of Théroüanne, and Jean Doule, *avocat-général* in the *Cour des Aides*, both of whom retained their posts for the rest of Henry's life⁴.

The officers named above, it will be observed, were French. Dauphinist authors and later French writers in general give the impression that under Henry Englishmen governed those parts of France where his authority was effective. There is no basis for such a notion. The officials appointed in France during Henry's regency were almost without exception Frenchmen. The *baillis*, so far as we know, were all French⁵. The great political and household officers, such as the chancellor, the marshals, the presidents of the *Parlement*, remained French⁶. The personnel of the royal Council, of the *Parlement*, of the *Chambre des Comptes*, and of the various departments of the household, so far as can be judged from the scanty available evidence, continued to be almost exclusively French⁷. Even the government

¹ Borrelli de Serres, iii. 159, 181, 183 sq.

² Ibid. 173, 177; Ordonnances, xi. 104.

³ Borrelli de Serres, iii. 137; cf. Fauquembergue, ii. 12; Bourgeois, 161, n. 2.

⁴ Borrelli de Serres, 137 sq.; Fauquembergue, ii. 26.

⁵ Ibid.; Bourgeois, 161, n. 2.

⁶ Jean le Clerc was appointed chancellor in November, 1420 (Fauquembergue, i. 375 n., 387), and held the position till 1425 (ibid. ii. 159). At the beginning of 1421, the marshals were the lord of L'Isle Adam and the lord of Chastellux. After his arrest, L'Isle Adam was succeeded by Jacques de Montbéron, a chamberlain of the duke of Burgundy. On Jan. 22, 1422, Chastellux and Montbéron were replaced by Antoine de Vergy, count of Dammartin, and Jean de la Baume-Montrevel, an appointment which was upheld, despite the protests of the lords who lost office (Fauquembergue, ii. 36 sq.; Bourgeois, 152, n. 4; Godefroy, Annotations, 797). For the presidents of the *Parlement*, see Fauquembergue, *passim*.

⁷ Exeter sat on the Council, it seems, when he was captain of Paris (Fauquembergue, ii. 9). At a council held by Henry in Paris on June 3, 1422, there were present Bedford, Exeter, the earl of March, and the chancellor of Normandy (ibid. 50), but the presence

of Paris, a matter of such vital concern to the English, was, as a rule, entrusted entirely to Frenchmen. All the *prévôts* were French¹; the police of the city was under Philippe de Morvilliers, the First President of the *Parlement*²; on July 8, 1421, Exeter was replaced as military governor of Paris by Jean de la Baume-Montrevel, lord of Valfin³. Indeed, the only important exceptions to the general rule were the captains of certain garrisons, the Bastille⁴, the castle of Bois de Vincennes⁵, and the towns of Montereau⁶, Melun⁷, and Dreux⁸, being held by English troops for at least part of Henry's regency. Of course all the French office-holders were of the Burgundian party, and there is reason to believe that the duke of Burgundy had much influence on Henry's appointments⁹.

The ordinances issued by the government at Paris from December, 1420, to August, 1422, were almost all concerned with the reform of the currency. The measures projected in December, 1420, speedily proved impracticable. The levy of silver had to be postponed¹⁰, and the price of the mark of silver, instead of being reduced to seven *livres tournois*, remained at twenty-six¹¹, while in February, 1421, the lack of metal was so great and the dangers of transporting it so serious that the masters of the mints were authorised to offer an additional 40s. *t.*¹² Meanwhile the existing coins were given and taken with but little regard to the value assigned them by official regulations¹³.

of the last shows that it was an extraordinary assembly, and the names of those recorded as having been retained as regular members of the royal Council in 1421 and 1422 are all French (*ibid.* ii. 1 sq., 9, 37). For the *Parlement*, see Fauquembergue, *passim*; for the *Chambre des Comptes*, Félibien, ii. 1533; for the king's household, Douët d'Arcq, i. 429 sqq., *Comptes*, 270 sqq.

¹ Fauquembergue, i. 390, ii. 12, 16, 37; Bourgeois, 147, n. 1, 152, n. 4, 156, n. 2.

² Douët d'Arcq, ii. 152.

³ Bourgeois, 152, n. 4; Félibien, ii. 1534.

⁴ Monstr. iv. 37; Chast. i. 220; Norm. Chron. 202; D.K.R. xlii. 408, 427; For. Accts. 74, G^v; Exch. Accts. 50/10.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 23; Chast. i. 203; Norm. Chron. 202; Exch. Accts. 50/12, 13.

⁶ D.K.R. xlii. 407; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 435.

⁷ Monstr. iv. 23; Chast. i. 203; D.K.R. xlii. 407.

⁸ *Ibid.* 432, 437, xlii. 638; For. Accts. 61, C; Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044, no. 5677.

⁹ It was while the duke of Burgundy was at Meaux that Hue de Lannoy was made master of the crossbowmen and that the marshals Chastellux and Montbéron were removed in favour of Antoine de Vergy and Jean de la Baume-Montrevel (Fauquembergue, ii. 36 sq.; Bourgeois, 152, n. 4; Godefroy, *Annotations*, 797).

¹⁰ Cf. above, p. 323.

¹¹ *Ordonnances*, xi. 108, 117; Fauquembergue, ii. 30.

¹² *Ordonnances*, xi. 117 sq.; Fauquembergue, ii. 30. ¹³ *Ordonnances*, xi. 115.

In June, 1421, a serious attempt was made to grapple with the situation. Unfortunately the government at first increased the prevailing confusion by applying its new rules locally. As if it were not bad enough that the value of the currency in Normandy was different from that at Paris, new regulations were announced in Picardy a month before similar but not precisely the same changes were published in the capital¹. There it was proclaimed on July 3 that throughout the realm the gold crown, which had latterly had the official value of four *francs* or *livres* and in some parts had actually been current at seven, should henceforth circulate at 30*s. t.*, while the silver *gros*, the coin on which most prices seem to have been based, was to be reduced from 20*d. t.* to 5, not to mention other changes on a similar scale. All monetary transactions, it was ordained, were to be made in terms of *sous* and *livres*. Rents and wages due in the past year were to be paid in the money most recently in circulation, which was to be valued at the rate which had been current. Loans were if possible to be repaid in the currency in which they had been advanced. Merchants, tradesmen, and others were to charge reasonably for their goods and labour on pain of severe punishment. There were one or two further clauses designed to obviate injustice².

The measure, as we have seen³, caused consternation in Paris. Taxes had to be paid in "forte monnoye," that is, according to the new rates, while the officials were believed to be paying their creditors and employés according to the old ones⁴. The agitation in Paris caused the government to make speedy concessions. Tenants of houses or other property in the *vicomté* of Paris might terminate their leases on Oct. 1, if they gave a month's notice, rent still due being paid according to the value of money at the time when their leases were granted⁵. Landlord and tenant no doubt often came to an amicable understanding. Most of the tenants of the cathedral gave notice, but the chapter agreed that its rents might be paid at the old rates⁶. This may have been an equitable concession, but it of

¹ Cordeliers, 295.

² Ordonnances, xi. 122 sq. In Picardy it had been laid down that the gold crown should be valued at 34*s. par.* i.e. 42*s. 6d. tourn.* After July 3, when the new regulations were proclaimed in Paris, Picardy ought no doubt to have come into line, but the Cordeliers chronicle certainly implies that it did not.

³ Above, p. 324.

⁴ Bourgeois, 155.

⁵ Ordonnances, xi. 125, 126; Bourgeois, 155.

⁶ *Ibid.* 155, n. 2.

course frustrated the government's attempt to bring the real value of money into some relation to its nominal value and thus to prepare the way for the introduction of a sound coinage. Farmers of taxes were also given the opportunity to terminate their agreements¹. On Aug. 11 came a fresh ordinance concerning the new money which was to be coined. The plans of the government had changed. They now intended to coin gold *saluts* worth 25*s. t.*, half-*saluts*, also of gold, and *blancs deniers*, made of an alloy of silver, which were to be worth 2*d. t.* and 1*d. t.* The masters of the mints were to give 6*s. 3d. t.* for the mark of silver—a price which does not suggest that silver was scarce, though the abandonment of the silver coinage projected a few months before gives a contrary impression².

The change in the government's programme was due to the dauphinists, who by counterfeiting the good money struck in accordance with the scheme of the previous winter had made its circulation futile³. So it was stated in an ordinance, published on Nov. 3 together with a second designed to mitigate the hardship which the new rules might occasion. The public was informed of the introduction of the new coins, many of the small ones having already been struck. Of the coins previously in circulation, the *gros* was to be reduced in value from 5*d. t.* to 2½⁴. The changers of the Pont de Paris were to give new money for old without charge. Those who possessed old money were not to hoard it on pain of having it forfeited; they must either circulate it or take it to the mint. Maximum prices were fixed for a number of commodities, and those concerned in certain trades were enjoined to reduce their charges in proportion to the changes in the value of the coinage⁵. These measures had to be supplemented in December by an ordinance regulating the payment of rents and debts, and imposing rules about the fulfilment of contracts. Its principles were generally those of the similar measure of the previous June⁶. At the same time there was drawn up an ordinance—not published, however, till Jan. 17, 1422—which forbade the use of any money save

¹ Ordonnances, xi. 125.

² Ibid. 128.

³ Ibid. 132 sqq.

⁴ Ibid. 133, 134.

⁵ Ibid. 134 sqq. As printed in the *Ordonnances*, the measures summarised apply only to Paris, but the rules about coinage were evidently of general application and no doubt precautions against a rise of prices were taken elsewhere. The Cordeliers chronicle (306) gives Sept. 3 as the date when the value of the *gros* or *flourette* was reduced, but this is almost certainly a mistake for Nov. 3.

⁶ Ordonnances, xi. 146 sqq.

English gold nobles, coins called *petits-moutons* worth 15*s. t.*, the *gros* (now worth 2½*d. t.*), and the coins struck since December, 1420, in Normandy and the territory under Henry's regency. No one was to export *gros* to places outside the king's obedience, and no bullion was to be transported except to the nearest mint¹.

The measures just outlined had to be supplemented in May, 1422, by an ordinance calling in all *gros*, as the dauphinists still found it profitable to counterfeit them². Next month the prohibition of the use of the *gros* was repeated in terms which showed that the first order had been widely disregarded³. Henry's efforts, however, had at least gained some success, and Fenin, who shows special interest in financial matters, considers that 1421 marked the end of the depreciation of the currency which had become serious after Agincourt⁴. The new small coins were good, and their nominal value being but low, the dauphinists, though they counterfeited them, hardly found it worth their while to do so⁵. Unfortunately, there were few other coins in circulation, and it was consequently very burdensome to carry large sums about. In his approval of Henry's measures Fenin is, however, probably voicing the opinion of property owners, who, with rents and dues fixed in *sols* and *livres*, had suffered greatly owing to the high value attributed to the coins in circulation, while tenants were often able to pay their rents with the price of a few bushels of grain⁶. In short, Henry's efforts to reform the currency, however conducive to the lasting welfare of the country at large, were not likely to increase his popularity with the peasants and tradesmen⁷.

Still more unpopular were the attempts made to collect the levy of silver authorised by the Estates in December, 1420. The whole matter is rather mysterious. In February, 1422, some of the clergy of Notre Dame declared that they had never heard of it. Others were under the impression that only a

¹ Ordonnances, xi. 143 sqq.

² Ibid. 163 sq.; Bourgeois, 173; Fenin, 188 sq. The coins were to be taken or sent to the nearest royal mint, which would pay for them according to the weight of silver they contained.

³ Ordonnances, xi. 168 sq.

⁴ Fenin, 189.

⁵ Cordeliers, 306; cf. Dieudonné, 264.

⁶ Fenin, 189 sq.; cf. Monstr. iv. 35, 71.

⁷ A butcher of Beauvais declared that it were better to be hanged than to pay rents in "forte monnaie," though he would have preferred to cut off the heads of officials who attempted to enforce the decree (Bourgeois, 155, n. 1).

forced loan had been authorised¹. Two chroniclers—one dauphinist, the other Burgundian—believed that the government undertook to pay in coin for the silver it received². There can be no doubt, however, that the levy was sanctioned by the Estates³; indeed, some of the Paris clergy admitted that a majority of the clerical Estate had voted for it⁴. But the government was slow in collecting the silver, though the need for it was admittedly great. The first serious efforts seem to have been made outside Paris. Here and there the officials were oppressive and demanded more than they were entitled to exact, Robert le Jeune, *bailli* of Amiens, being a conspicuous offender⁵. In the capital the collection of the silver was begun during the winter of 1421-1422⁶. It caused much consternation, and little was received until Henry returned after the siege of Meaux, when the collectors set to work in earnest⁷.

There was much murmuring, especially against Philippe de Morvilliers, who seems to have used drastic methods to enforce payment⁸; but fear of Henry prevented open resistance⁹. Some of the accounts of the receivers are extant. They show that considerable trouble must have been taken over the assessment of individuals, and that the levy really was of general application, very influential people being made to contribute¹⁰. The silver might be handed over in any form, provided that it was of the proper weight¹¹. In the extracts from the accounts printed by Douët d'Arcq, no one appears as assessed for more than fifty marks¹²; while many, of very various callings, were

¹ Grassoreille, 145, n. 2. This seems to have been believed at Troyes (Boutiot, ii. 453).

² Juv. 562; Fenin, 190. This misapprehension was probably due to confusion of this levy with the similar one in Normandy (see above, p. 237), where the "marks" were paid for by the government.

³ Above, p. 229.

⁴ Grassoreille, 145, n. 2.

⁵ Fenin, 190; Monstr. iv. 77.

⁶ Grassoreille, 144, n. 2.

⁷ Monstr. iv. 100 sq.; Chast. i. 313.

⁸ Bourgeois, 159, 161 sq.

⁹ Monstr. iv. 101.

¹⁰ E.g. Jehan Camart, advocat en parlement (4 oz.); "les demourans au Palais"; Madame d'Orgemont, presumably the wife of Pierre d'Orgemont (50 marks); Guy Guilbaut, "trésorier de monsieur le duc de Bourgogne" (10 marks); Martelet Testat, "trésorier de la Royné" (2 marks); Pierre de Marigny, king's confessor, and maître des Requêtes de l'Hôtel (10 marks).—Douët d'Arcq, i. 420, 426, 427. In August, 1421, the University of Paris had sent a deputation to beg Henry for exemption, but in vain (Deniffe, Chart. iv. 395 sq., 397; Douët d'Arcq, i. 419, 420). Only students, soldiers, coiners, and the very poor were exempt (ibid. 424, 425, 428). There seems to have been a right of appeal from the assessors to the Council, and it must be admitted that several notable people had their assessments greatly reduced.

¹¹ Ibid. 415 sq.

¹² Madame d'Orgemont was assessed at that amount and apparently raised no objection (ibid. 426).

called upon for only two ounces. The assessment on three *quartiers* of Paris, including the Cité, amounted to 415 marks, but the expenses of collection, with defaults and exemptions, reduced to 311 marks the sum actually paid into the Paris mint¹.

There were many causes of discontent. In Paris the winter was again a hard one. There were great floods in December, lasting for ten days, and these were followed by severe frost, which stopped the water-mills. The severity shown by Philippe de Morvilliers in enforcing the currency regulations and measures consequent upon them, drew on him general execration. Pierre d'Orgemont and Jean Doule² were also much hated, for they were believed to have fixed the maximum prices of commodities, which, we are told, so crippled trade that nothing could be bought but bread and wine. Tenants of houses were very hard hit by changes in the currency notwithstanding the precautions taken for their protection. Many left their homes, sold their goods in the street, and left Paris for Rouen, Senlis, the woods, or the Armagnacs. Wherever one went in Paris, one saw people begging alms, and getting little, for everyone was hard up. Curses against fortune and the government were to be heard everywhere, with prayers for the end of the war and vengeance on the Armagnac traitors. It is noteworthy that the "Bourgeois," from whom comes nearly all our knowledge of conditions in Paris at this time, never blames the English for the troubles of the city during Henry's regency. To him the dauphinists are still the source and origin of the people's sufferings³. Probably most Parisians were more critical of the English, but the diarist's attitude was not that of a mere time-server, for he was very bitter about several Burgundian officials who owed their appointments to Henry.

The centre of resistance in Paris continued to be the cathedral. The chapter gained a great success when, in June, 1421, Martin V confirmed the election of Courtecuisse to the see⁴. The University and even, it seems, the *Parlement* were friendly to the bishop⁵; but Henry was not to be placated⁶, especially

¹ Douët d'Arcq, i. 417, 424 sq.

² Cf. above, p. 380.

³ Bourgeois, 163.

⁴ Grassoreille, 138, n. 3, 139, n. 1.

⁵ Bourgeois, 164, n. 2; Fauquembergue, ii. 24.

⁶ For conciliatory advances on the part of the chapter, see Grassoreille, 139, n. 1, 140, n. 2, 141, n. 1.

as the chapter soon afterwards tried to avoid contributing to the cost of the soldiers which the civic authorities were raising for the siege of Meaux¹. In the winter Courtecuisse, who had been living at St Germain-des-Prés, moved into Paris; but, as he did not take up his residence on cathedral property, the clergy were able to plead in answer to Henry's request for his ejection that they were in no way responsible for his movements². The tide, however, was turning against the chapter. In December, Charles VI, then at Meaux, was made to ordain the deprivation of its dauphinist members—a measure justified by the terms of the treaty of Troyes³. It is true that no action seems to have followed; but the chapter was less fortunate in relation to the levy of silver, which it vainly endeavoured to evade⁴. And meanwhile Henry must have been bargaining with the pope to some effect, for on July 24 it was announced that Courtecuisse had been translated to Geneva⁵, and immediately afterwards Jean de la Rochetaillée, patriarch of Constantinople—a partisan of the Burgundian party—was appointed perpetual administrator of the see in spirituals and temporals⁶. Henry thus scored the last point, but the honours of the dispute undoubtedly belonged to the chapter.

One of the matters that exercised Henry's mind during the winter was the state of the king's household. He had in 1420 abolished the funds called the *Coffres* and the *Épargne*, which were administered at the king's discretion⁷; and in September, 1421, the offices of master of the *Chambre aux deniers*, of the *Garnisons de vins*, and of the *Argenterie* had been placed in a single hand⁸, while about the same time a number of secretaries had been removed from the household establishment⁹. He now caused to be drawn up an ordinance fixing the number of officers and menials in each department of the household and defining their duties and wages¹⁰. It made no attempt to alter the main lines on which French kings had been wont to conduct their establishments, and its object seems to have been the

¹ Grassoreille, 138, n. 2.

² Ibid. 142, n. 1, 143, n. 2, 144, n. 1; Bourgeois, 164.

³ Grassoreille, 141 sq.

⁴ Ibid. 144, n. 2, 145, nn. 1, 2, 146, nn. 1, 2.

⁵ Ibid. 146, n. 3.

⁶ Ibid. 148, n. 2; Bibl. nat., Portefeuilles de Fontanieu, 111-112, pp. 278 sqq.

⁷ Borrelli de Serres, iii. 199, 205.

⁸ Douët d'Arcq, Comptes, 270 sq.; Borrelli de Serres, iii. 190, 195.

⁹ Douët d'Arcq, Comptes, 272 sq.

¹⁰ Douët d'Arcq, i. 429 sqq.

removal of abuses and the curtailment of superfluous expenditure. A comparison of the ordinance with earlier household accounts shows that the personnel of the household was paid on approximately the same scale as that of forty years before; if in some cases the wages prescribed in the ordinance are less, in others they are greater¹. It was ordained that chamberlains and *maîtres d'hôtel* were not to draw pay or allowances unless they were actually at court or employed elsewhere on household business. Meals in private rooms were not to be allowed; those entitled to board were to eat in hall. What was over from their ration of victuals and other things was to be given in alms and not sold. Those who were allowed horses must keep them, or suffer a deduction from their allowances. The transactions of the *maître* of the *Chambre aux deniers* were to be strictly checked by the controller, and the clerks of the several departments must render daily accounts. All household officers must swear to obey the ordinance².

It is tempting to emphasise the significance of this measure. The Burgundians later accused Henry of having reduced Charles VI's household by a half³. No doubt, in the recent confused and corrupt times, many abuses had grown up in the household, and Henry, with his orderly mind, naturally sought to remedy them. There is no reason to suppose, however, that the ordinance was directed to the humiliation of Charles VI. It dealt with the household of the king of France, not with the private establishment of an invalid, and Henry, who doubtless expected to succeed to the French crown before long, certainly had no desire to diminish the efficiency or dignity of the court. The ordinance was enacted on July 1, 1422. From then to the death of Charles VI the total wages of the household officers were proportionally greater than they had been in the previous six months⁴. So, moreover, were the ordinary expenses of the household⁵.

It is often supposed, however, that after the treaty of Troyes Charles VI lived in neglect and poverty, while Henry was surrounded with splendour and comfort. This belief is based on

¹ Douët d'Arcq, i. 435, 438, 439, 441, 442, 444, 445, Comptes, 16, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 201, 202, 204, 205, 206.

² Ibid. i. 445 sq.

³ La Barre, i. 341.

⁴ From July 1 to Nov. 11 they totalled 1094 *liv. par.*; for the previous six months they had amounted to 1225 *liv. par.* (Douët d'Arcq, Comptes, 280, 285).

⁵ Ibid.

the statements of certain French writers about the way in which the two kings respectively celebrated Christmas in 1420 and Whitsuntide in 1422¹. There is no reason to suppose that the contrast was deliberately arranged by Henry. After all Charles was a lunatic, whose lucid moments were now rare and imperfect. Henry was regent, and very active in that capacity. It is not surprising, however reprehensible, that the Burgundian lords and the Parisians should have thronged to him and forgotten their king. Apart from these festive occasions, there was little opportunity for magnificent display by Henry at the expense of Charles, seeing that he was either in England or campaigning from January, 1421, to the end of May, 1422. Charles, meanwhile, was generally at Bois de Vincennes², though, as we have seen, he probably visited Meaux during the siege³. Some of the staff of the household were evidently at Henry's disposal, and for a time, at any rate, Renaud Doriac, master of the *Chambre aux deniers* and other offices, and Monsieur de Rance, *mâitre d'hôtel*, were with Henry at the siege of Meaux⁴. But the fact that two or three officers are specially named as being in the service of the regent indicates that the majority were still in the service of the king; and an examination of the household accounts from September, 1421, to November, 1422, leaves no doubt that they refer almost, if not quite exclusively, to the personal *entourage* of Charles VI. It is true that if these accounts be compared with those of the early years of Charles VI's reign the totals of both receipts and expenditure show a great diminution. For instance, for St John term, 1383, the household receipts came to 40,117 *livres parisis*, while the expenses totalled 49,348. For the corresponding term of 1422, however, the receipts were 15,953 *liv. par.*, the expenses 14,124. Comparing the sums devoted to officers' wages in the two terms, we find a decrease from 4173 *liv. par.* to 1225⁵. But it must be remembered that in the first years of Charles's reign, the authority of the crown was as effective over the greater part of France as it ever was during the Hundred Years' War, while in 1422 it could make itself felt over but a small and much impoverished area. Considering

¹ See pp. 232, 406.

² Fauquembergue, ii. 21; Douët d'Arcq, Comptes, 272, 275, 278.

³ See p. 344.

⁴ Douët d'Arcq, i. 434, 437, Comptes, 274 sq.

⁵ Ibid. pp. xxx, 201, 280.

the situation, Charles VI's household seems to have been conducted with reasonable liberality¹. It is likely enough that Charles was not well served by his personal attendants, but that would be due to his malady, which in those days excited derision and cruelty rather than sympathy and devotion. Henry was doubtless a hard man, but he was not a foolish man, and it would have been foolish for him to countenance any diminution of the respect hitherto commanded by the French crown.

The significance of the accounts of the French royal household cannot fully appear unless they are viewed in the light of the general financial situation.

This is not easy to understand. We are lucky in the possession of the household accounts of Charles VI for the last fourteen months of his reign, and it is still more fortunate that we have the detailed account of William Philip, who was Henry's keeper of the wardrobe and treasurer of war from Oct. 1, 1421, to the king's death, remaining in office till Nov. 8, 1422². But the practice of providing Philip with money through the king's chamber often makes it impossible to be sure what was the ultimate source of the funds at his disposal. Still, with the help of the Issue Rolls of the English Exchequer, one can hazard a rough estimate of the respective contributions of the various regions controlled by Henry to the cost of the war.

Philip's account gives his total receipts as £55,080. Of this £11,125 is entered as drawn from the English Exchequer. The remainder is described as *Recepta Forinseca*³. Sums amounting to £3313 are mentioned as coming from the fees of the great seal of Normandy, from transactions of the Rouen mint, and from the Rouen indemnity. Royal officers in Normandy and France, with the king's chamber, furnished in French money a sum equivalent to £5206. £4900 came from perquisites of war. £9575 of the so-called receipts were unpaid debts, and existed only for purposes of book-keeping. Of the balance of the *Recepta Forinseca*—£20,961—a very large proportion was

¹ Queen Isabel may have had some ground for complaint, seeing that from Nov. 3, 1421, to June 30, 1422, she received for her household only 75*l. t.* However, she managed to spend 666*3l. t.* (Douët d'Arcq, Comptes, p. xxiii). On paper the dauphin's receipts and expenditure were much greater than his father's, totalling respectively 120,854*l. t.* and 189,167*l. t.* in St John term, 1422 (*ibid.*). We must remember, however, that the currency in his territories was almost worthless (Dieudonné, 498).

² For. Accts. 69, F, G, H, I.

³ For. Accts. 69, F.

paid to Philip by the king's chamber, to which at least £19,318 was sent across the Channel by the English Exchequer¹. Apart from Normandy, the contribution of which has been discussed above², it is evident that Philip cannot have received much from French sources, and that by far the greater part of his receipts came from England.

It is true that the money was not all devoted to military purposes. Philip's expenditure is put at £55,083³. Of this, no more than £25,808 figures as *prestita et soluciones guerre*⁴, while £24,389 is entered under the head of household expenses⁵. Not only, however, was the royal household the General Headquarters of the army, but there is a further section, devoted to *prestita ad receptam scaccarii*, which records little save payments to troops enlisted for service in France⁶. While it is thus impossible to estimate precisely how much of the money spent by Philip was devoted to military needs and how much was absorbed by services, in the household or elsewhere, which would in any case have been rendered, it is evidently safe to say that by far the greater part of the expenditure for which he accounts was essentially military expenditure; nor must it be forgotten that the English Exchequer paid many military expenses without any intervention on Philip's part⁷. One is, in short, confirmed in the impression left by an investigation of Philip's receipts—that the cost of the fighting in France was still being shouldered mainly by the English.

Later, when the duke of Burgundy was seeking pretexts for abandoning the English alliance, he accused Henry of having used the revenues of the French crown in his own interests⁸. There seems to be no record of the receipts of the French treasury for 1421 or 1422. In 1423 they amounted to approximately 152,000 *liv. tourn.*⁹, and it is unlikely that they were greater in either of the two previous years. Now from the beginning of September, 1421, to the death of Charles VI, the money allotted to his household amounted to 48,209 *liv. tourn.*, a

¹ For. Accts. 69, F, F v^o; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 3, 1422, 10 Hen. V, Pasch., April 20, July 29, 1422.

² See above, p. 259.

³ For. Accts. 69, I.

⁴ Ibid. G sqq.

⁵ Ibid. F v^o, G.

⁶ Ibid. I.

⁷ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., 10 Hen. V, Pasch., *passim*; cf. p. 319.

⁸ La Barre, i. 341.

⁹ G. Ritter, *Extraits du Journal du Trésor*, in *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, lxxiii. 472 sq., 478 sq. The receipts here recorded presumably come from both "ordinary" and "extraordinary" sources.

large proportion of his whole revenue¹. Of this 45,834*l. t.* was expended on the actual maintenance of the household, that is to say, the king's personal establishment, for Charles's household did not occupy the position in political and military affairs which was taken by Henry's. Over and above the money assigned to the royal household, there may have been about 100,000 *liv. tourn.* which Henry might have turned to his own advantage. At three shillings to the *livre*, this is equivalent to £15,000 sterling. Even had Henry applied the whole of this sum to the expenses of his warfare against the dauphinists, it would have been small in comparison with the English contribution and not much greater than that of Normandy. From Henry's point of view, the dauphinists were rebels against the French crown. He had contracted to make war upon them with English resources, but it was only just that French resources should be devoted to the same end. Regarded in this light, the amount allotted to Charles's needs seems not ungenerous. After all, there was a civil war in progress, more than half the resources of the realm were in the hands of the dauphinists, and, even had the treaty of Troyes never been signed and Henry never become regent, some abatement of the pomp and luxury surrounding the French crown would probably have been inevitable and certainly decent.

¹ Douët d'Arcq, *Comptes*, 271, 277, 280, 284.

CHAPTER LXXIV

THE CLOSE OF THE REIGN IN ENGLAND

DURING the period of nearly fifteen months which elapsed between Henry's final departure from the country and his death, the history of England itself was comparatively uneventful. Until April, 1422, the duke of Bedford was *custos* of the realm. His authority was bestowed on him on June 10, 1421, at Dover: except that he might not receive the fealty of greater prelates or restore their temporalities without consulting the king, and that he was not to receive homage from other landowners, he was endowed with royal powers, which, however, he might only exercise according to the advice of the Council¹. There is no information as to the relations between the Council and Bedford, which presumably were amicable.

The event which excited most interest—and indeed it was of the highest importance—was the birth of a son to Henry and Catherine. This took place at Windsor at 4 p.m. on St Nicholas' Day, Dec. 6². In London the bells were pealed, and a *Te Deum* was sung at St Paul's in the presence of the chancellor, many other bishops, the mayor, the aldermen and the craft-gilds³. At Paris, where the news became known on Dec. 22, it gave an excuse for the kindling of the usual bon-fires⁴, and two days later the *Parlement* took part in processions of thanksgiving at Notre Dame⁵, while rejoicing was general in the parts of France which adhered to the Burgundian party⁶. As for Henry, engaged in besieging Meaux, it is uncertain what he thought or said⁷; but he characteristically sent word

¹ Rym. x. 129 sq. His powers were identical with those bestowed on him in 1415 and 1417 (*ibid.* ix. 305 sq., 475 sq.).

² Letter Bk. I. 264; Vita, 321; Walsingham, ii. 342; Brut, ii. 427, 492; Chron. Lond. 110; Kingsford, Chron. 74, 128; Denifle, Auct. ii. c. 285.

³ Brut, ii. 448.

⁴ Bourgeois, 163.

⁵ Fauquembergue, ii. 33. Two months before a solemn Mass had been celebrated at Notre Dame with a view to securing for Catherine a happy delivery (Grassoreille, 141, n. 2).

⁶ Cordeliers, 308.

⁷ According to the author of the Vita, he was much delighted at the news; but in the sixteenth century it was believed that he said to Lord Fitzhugh, "I Henry borne at Monmouth shall small tyme reigne and much get, and Henry borne at Wyndorsore shall long reigne and al lese, but as God will so be it," Halle, 108.

to Catherine that she must hear a Mass of the Trinity and offer the child to God¹. The infant was baptized by Archbishop Chichele; his godparents were the duke of Bedford, Bishop Beaufort, and Jacqueline of Hainault², a trio whose selection might have been suggested by the Spirit of Irony in its most mischievous mood. The churching of the queen, to which many notable people were summoned, was on Jan. 12³. By March 19 the little prince had a household of his own⁴.

Mention has already been made of the lamentations and forebodings of Adam of Usk in the previous spring⁵. There was, however, little sign of discontent or unrest during what was left of the king's life. Queen Joan remained in detention, but she was still treated with liberality⁶ and on July 13, 1422, an order was issued for her release and the restoration of her goods⁷, though it was not executed until after Henry's death⁸. The principal cause of apprehension seems to have been Sir John Mortimer, of Hatfield. At some date unknown, but prior to the end of the parliament of May, 1421, he was arrested by order of the Council on suspicion of treason, and committed to the Tower⁹. He was not brought to trial, and at first his imprisonment was probably regarded as precautionary, for the Council returned a favourable answer to his wife when she petitioned for a grant of money on which to live, and in November it consented that the arrears of an annuity of £40, granted him by the king, should be paid. Shortly afterwards, however, Bedford transferred him to an underground dungeon¹⁰. The next we hear of him is that he has escaped, apparently in

¹ Vita, 321.

² Wals. ii. 342; Brut, ii. 427, 492; Chron. Lond. 110; Kingsford, Chron. 74, 128; Monstr. iv. 80; Löher, Beiträge, 221.

³ Devon, 370.

⁴ From March 19 to the end of the reign £160 is recorded to have been paid by the Treasury to John Bateman, treasurer of the household of the lord prince (Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., March 19, 1422; *ibid.* 10 Hen. V, Pasch., June 16, July 13, 1422).

⁵ See above, p. 277.

⁶ The Issue Rolls record numerous payments to Thomas Lilbourne for the expenses of her household. On July 15, 1422, £106. 13s. 4d. was granted to pay for horses bought for her chaise (Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., July 15, 1422).

⁷ Rot. Parl. iv. 248.

⁸ *Ibid.* 247 sqq. On Aug. 30, 1422, the Treasury was still allotting money to Lilbourne from the issues of Joan's lands for the expenses of her household (Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., Aug. 30, 1422).

⁹ Rot. Parl. iv. 160.

¹⁰ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 296, 307, 311. Mortimer's removal underground is mentioned by his wife in a petition which is undated; but the wording of the document indicates that it must have occurred after the concession made by the Council respecting his annuity.

the company of John Braquemont, knight, Marselin de Flisc, of Genoa, Thomas Payne and others, who also had been imprisoned in the Tower. The date of the escape is not known, but it may be conjectured that it occasioned the order of Feb. 28, 1422, to the bishops of the southern counties, instructing them to concert measures for the preservation of order with the justices of the peace and other notable men of that part of the country¹. Braquemont, Flisc, and Payne were caught in Somerset², when does not appear. Mortimer himself was retaken in April³, but we do not know where. He was brought back to the Tower, but in May he was sent to Pevensey castle, where he was kept till June, 1423⁴. He was then restored to the Tower, whence in 1424 he again escaped, with tragic consequences that are well known⁵.

The episode is mysterious. Mortimer was eventually convicted on the ground that his second escape was treasonable⁶. We are told nothing of the reasons for his original imprisonment, except that it was on suspicion of treason. That he was never brought to trial until 1424—and then merely on the ground that it was treasonable to break prison—suggests that there was not much evidence for the original charge against him. It may be, however, that he was suspected of plotting in the interests of the earl of March, and in that case, no matter

¹ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 413. Braquemont (Cal. Pat. 1422-29, p. 186; Claus. 1 Hen. VI, 18; Rym. x. 279; Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 23) and Flisc (Cal. Pat. 1422-29, p. 186) were prisoners of war. Thomas Payne, who came from Glamorgan, is said to have been Oldcastle's confidential secretary (Ord. Priv. Co. v. 104; Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., April 30, July 10, 1422). He had been captured in the rising of 1414, but had escaped unhurt; and some time between July, 1417, and the end of 1419, he had taken a leading part in a carefully planned plot to rescue the king of Scots, then at Windsor, and convey him to Scotland. He was, however, caught by Thomas Haseley, a clerk of the crown, who had lain in wait for him near Windsor for five days and six nights. He was committed to prison to await the king's return from France, and at the first parliament of 1421 he was brought before Henry and the lords, who questioned Haseley about the arrest, the king declaring, if Haseley is to be believed, that it "pleased him more than I hadde geten or gyven him £10,000 for the grete inconveniences that weren like to afalle in his longe absence." Payne, however, was merely committed to the Tower (Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 309, v. 104 seq.), without undergoing any trial (Rot. Parl. iv. 196). Devon's translation (372, 375) of the entries relating to the escape is grossly misleading. Only Payne was accused of having been associated with Oldcastle.

² Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., April 30, July 10, 1422. They were sent back to the Tower, where they were at Henry's death (Cal. Pat. 1422-29, p. 186).

³ Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., April 30, 1422. When news of his capture reached Westminster, the Council was at Southampton. This proves the date to have been April (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 427, 428, 443; Rym. x. 201, 204, 205 sq.).

⁴ Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 332; Claus. 10 Hen. V, m. 6; For. Accts. 59, A; Devon, 384.

⁵ Rot. Parl. iv. 202, 260; Devon, 389; Brut, ii. 431, 564.

⁶ Rot. Parl. iv. 202, 260.

how strong the evidence, publicity would be the thing that the government most wished to avoid.

The summer of 1421 was wet and stormy in the north, and the hay and corn harvest was largely spoiled¹. There was much disorder and violence in various regions², but the evidence does not suggest that hostility to Henry or his policy was the cause, or indeed that the insecurity of life and property was worse than usual. It has often been asserted that, under the crushing weight of taxation, the war had become unpopular³; but, apart from Adam of Usk, no chronicler suggests that this was so, and little indication of it can be found in official records. The proceedings of the parliament which met on Dec. 1, 1421⁴, certainly lend no colour to the belief. There was an exceptionally small attendance of temporal lords. Only three earls, those of Northumberland, Westmorland, and Devon, received writs, and no more than twelve barons. With the exception of James Lord Berkeley⁵, all had been summoned to the parliament of the previous May. The eight judges and two serjeants-at-law were the same as those summoned on that occasion⁶. The writs *de expensis* are not enrolled, but returns are known to have been received from all the usual shires and from ninety-four cities or boroughs⁷. Of the county members thirty-five had previously been elected to parliament since the beginning of the reign, eighteen more than once, though only eight had been returned to the last parliament. Seventy-nine of the citizens and burgesses returned had had previous parliamentary experience under Henry V; of these forty-six had been returned more than once, and thirty-two to the first parliament of the year⁸. How many members

¹ Fine Roll 9 Hen. V, in. 11.

² A quarrel between the coroners of Northumberland caused some disturbance in that county (Claus. 9 Hen. V, mm. 11 d, 21, 22 d), Westmorland was evidently very disorderly (Rot. Parl. iv. 163), and unpunished acts of violence in Staffordshire were the subject of a petition presented in the parliament of December (*ibid.* 164).

³ See e.g. Newhall, 150, n. 34; Vickers, 373.

⁴ Rot. Parl. iv. 150.

⁵ His claim to succeed to Berkeley castle had just been recognised (G.E.C. i. 330).

⁶ Rept. Dign. Peer, iv. 852.

⁷ Return Parl. i. 297 sqq.

⁸ Return Parl. i. pp. xix, xx, xxi, 278 sqq. Some of the city and borough representatives, if they had attended when elected, were old parliamentary hands. Thus, Walter Shirley of Salisbury had already been elected eight times since Henry's accession (*ibid.* 280, 282, 285, 286, 290, 293, 296, 298), John Harleston of Wilton and William Gascoigne of Bridgwater seven times (*ibid.* xix, 279, 284, 285, 286, 290, 292, 293, 295, 296, 298), Thomas Godeston of Colchester and John Whithorn of Wilton six times (*ibid.* 278, 283, 285, 286, 289, 290, 291, 293, 294, 296, 298).

were actually present there seems to be no means of telling, but it may be inferred from the figures just given that this parliament was by no means an inexperienced body. As reported in the rolls, the chancellor's opening speech was exceptionally unilluminating. Speaking on the text *Lex Domini immaculata convertiens animas*¹, he discoursed on the three kinds of law and on the three virtues—faith, hope, and charity—and went on to announce that the causes of the summons of parliament were the conservation of the peace of the realm, the defence of its frontiers and the common profit². Probably, however, he was really rather more specific, for on the very same day, even before a Speaker had been chosen, the commons granted a fifteenth and a tenth, half of each to be paid at the ensuing Candlemas, the other half at the next feast of St Martin in winter³, the four northern counties being exempted⁴. The main purpose of the grant was described as the defence of the realm⁵; but at the time England was not threatened with any serious danger from outside, and everyone must have known that the greater part of the money would be spent, directly or indirectly, on the war in France. After Christmas, as had been ordained in the previous parliament, gold money was to be valued according to its weight⁶; but as a concession to the tax-payer it was agreed by the government that a gold noble worth 5s. 8d. in weight would be accepted by the collectors at its nominal value of 6s. 8d.⁷ On Dec. 3 the commons presented as their Speaker Richard Banyard, esquire, one of the members for Essex, who had been returned to the second parliament of 1414, but had not been elected since⁸. The common petitions were exceptionally few, and mostly concerned the reform of the currency that was then being carried out. They are not of great interest, their principal purpose being to prevent fraud on the part of money-changers and to enable the public to obtain the new money on fair terms⁹. The government granted a petition that the mint at Calais should be re-established for the coining of money of the same quality as that issued at the Tower¹⁰, and it was also

¹ Ps. xix. 7.

² Rot. Parl. iv. 150.

³ Ibid. 151; Fine Roll 9 Hen. V, mm. 6-10.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Rot. Parl. iv. 151.

⁶ See above, p. 277.

⁷ Rot. Parl. iv. 151; Chron. Lond. 109 sq.

⁸ Rot. Parl. iv. 151; Return Parl. i. 283, 299.

⁹ Rot. Parl. iv. 154 sq.; Statutes, ii. 209 sq.

¹⁰ Rot. Parl. iv. 154; Statutes, ii. 210.

agreed that justices of the peace, sheriffs, escheators, or special commissioners might take action against forgers of weights and imprison them without mainprise until their trial¹. The most notable of the petitions was one about the jurisdiction of the Council and the chancellor. It pointed out that although divers statutes had enacted that none of the king's lieges should be required to make answer in any suit save by original writ and due process according to the law of the land, nevertheless certain of them had been summoned before the Council or the chancellor by letters of privy seal and writs of *subpoena*. The commons therefore begged that when in such a case the plaintiff had a remedy at common law, the defendant might take exception to the jurisdiction of the court before which he was cited, and that the case should thereupon be dismissed². They further asked that all such proceedings should, if then pending, be forthwith quashed, save when they had been initiated by authority of parliament. The commons put forward this petition as a matter of grace, notwithstanding their appeal to statutes, and it is not surprising that it was answered with the polite formula of refusal³. Though the protest concerned only civil suits, it is remarkable to find the commons betraying so much suspicion towards the Council in the reign of the most popular of the reputedly constitutional Lancastrians.

This parliament witnessed some interesting judicial proceedings of the kind that often took up much of the members' time and much space in the rolls, though usually ignored by writers on constitutional history. William Lord Clinton and Say, who was himself summoned to this parliament as one of the lords temporal⁴, had petitioned the commons to pray Bedford and the lords to ordain by authority of parliament that one William de

¹ Rot. Parl. iv. 155; Statutes, ii. 210.

² "Come il soit contenuz en diverses Estatuts. . . que nulles de ses Lieges serra amesnez en respounse, sinon par Brief Original et due Proces selonc la Leie de la Terre; et ensi soit, que diverses des Lieges de notre. . . Seigneur sont faitz venir deuant son Conseil et son Chancellor, par lettres de Privee Seales, et briefs Sub Pena. . . et (*sic*) si ascuns tiels lettres ou briefs soient grauntez et puisse apparer par la declaration del Plaintiff, que sa action est a la commune Leie, que le Defendant soit admiz de prendre exception al jurisdiction de court, et dire que le Pleintif ad remedié sufficeant pur luy a la commune leie en son cas, et que cell exception soit a ly aloue, et sur cell dimisiez hors de court" (Rot. Parl. iv. 156).

³ The petition closed with the formula "pur Dieu et en oevere de charitee," common form in petitions of individuals for royal grace and favour but most unusual in petitions of the commons in parliament. The answer was "Soit il advisee par le Roi" (Rot. Parl. iv. 156).

⁴ Rept. Dign. Peer, iv. 852.

la Poole should carry out an agreement which he had made with the petitioner. The petition, having been publicly read in parliament, Poole was called before Bedford and the lords and questioned. His answers were unconvincing, as, according to the justices concerned, they had been on the numerous occasions when the case had come before the courts. It was consequently ordained by authority of parliament that Poole should execute the agreement in the sense desired. He then came again into parliament, and, in the presence of Bedford and the lords, delivered to Clinton two deeds giving effect to the decision¹. The episode presents several interesting features. It appears, for instance, that Bedford and the lords could still be regarded as "parliament," but, on the other hand, it is remarkable to find one of the lords addressing his fellows through the medium of the commons.

Another case—originating in a suit about tithes—was laid before parliament by the chancellor, who, despite long proceedings before him, had been unable to determine whether it belonged to the temporal or to the spiritual courts. The chancellor explained the issues to parliament, and the parties, whom he had ordered to be present, were heard by counsel. The justices of the two benches and the chief baron of the Exchequer, then being present, were charged by Bedford to give their opinion, and when they had done so in a reasoned statement, Bedford and the lords accordingly pronounced that the matter was one for the ecclesiastical court to decide².

The date when parliament was dissolved does not appear in the roll. It was still sitting on Dec. 18³, so that, even if it ended immediately afterwards, many members could not have got home for Christmas.

There is no reason to suppose that the public grumbled more than usual at the readiness of parliament to meet the government's demands. The collection of the taxes voted was promptly begun⁴, and by Feb. 2 the money was coming in at the Exchequer⁵. It has been argued that the proceeds of the grant were disappointing⁶, but the Receipt Rolls show that they came to about £32,700, £15,700 of which

¹ Rot. Parl. iv. 151 sqq.

² Ibid. 153.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Jan. 23, 1422. Collectors had been appointed on Dec. 29 (Fine Roll 9 Hen. V, m. 8).

⁵ Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., May 28, 1422.

⁶ Newhall, 150; Ramsay, Antiquary, viii. 96.

was paid before Henry's death¹, and if the total is below the average yield of a fifteenth and tenth, it must be remembered that the tax-payer could meet a demand for a noble with money intrinsically worth only 5*s.* 8*d.* It appears, nevertheless, that there remained an urgent need for ready cash; for in March commissioners were appointed to raise a loan in twenty southern and midland counties². In each county the sum to be asked for was its share of the second half of the fifteenth and tenth, due at Martinmas, when the debt would be repaid. There seems to have been little response. It is true that in the last six months of Henry's life £8800 was raised on loan; but nearly all of this was lent in July and most of it by bishops, judges, and important government officials³. There is, however, nothing very significant in a widespread reluctance to find two instalments of a tax within a few weeks.

What financial difficulties were felt by the government were due rather to the magnitude of their task than to any exhaustion on the part of the country. Every source of money was thoroughly exploited. The sequestration of the lands of Queen Joan must have been a godsend to the Exchequer. For the board and maintenance of Joan herself, Thomas Lilbourne drew some £1300 from Henry's departure in June, 1421, to his death. In the same period, however, the chamber received £5642 from the issues of her lands; Queen Catherine had £1175, mainly in repayment of her loan of May, 1421; John Radcliffe had £1010 for the upkeep of the castle of Fronsac in Guienne; and nearly £300 of Joan's revenues were spent on provisions and munitions for France⁴. £8000 was indeed a substantial addition to the public revenue.

It is of course notorious that no accurate notion of the state of the Treasury at a given date can be obtained from the Receipt

¹ Rec. Rolls 9 Hen. V, Mich. (no. 698), 10 Hen. V, Pasch. (nos. 701, 702), 1 Hen. VI, Mich. (no. 703).

² The counties concerned were Kent, Sussex, Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Herts., Hunts., Northants., Gloucestershire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Staffordshire, Herefordshire, Leicestershire, Notts., Devon, Cornwall, Beds., and Bucks. (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 416 sq.). A commission was appointed for Somerset on April 7 (*ibid.* 427). It is of course possible that less formal bargaining may have occurred in counties which are not named in the Chancery rolls.

³ Rec. Rolls 9 Hen. V, Mich. (no. 698), March 11, 10 Hen. V, Pasch. (no. 702), April 20, May 27, June 8, July 11, 14, 23. Professor Newhall states (149, n. 32) that £11,086 was borrowed during Easter term, 10 Hen. V, but I cannot see how he gets his total.

⁴ Iss. Rolls 9 Hen. V, Pasch., to 10 Hen. V, Pasch. The entries relating to Queen Joan's lands are numerous.

and Issue rolls. One can, however, derive from them a general impression of the position of the national finances. On the whole there was no great difficulty in raising money. The taxes voted in 1421 yielded £36,200 before Easter, 1423. In 1421 and 1422 nearly £47,000 was raised by borrowing¹. Nevertheless the outlook was not cheering. If England was still to contribute to the cost of the war as she was doing in the years 1421-1422, the extraordinary revenue—i.e. that produced by loans or parliamentary grants—must remain as great as in those years. This even Henry himself would hardly have dared to suggest; and Bedford immediately recognised that if the war was to go on, it must be supported mainly by the resources of Normandy and the rest of France. But to think of England as exhausted in the last years of Henry V inevitably leads to misapprehension of the later phases of the war. The burden of the war rested mainly on England until Henry's death; and it was sustained with little apparent difficulty. Had the country really been drained by Henry, it could not, even after the respite from taxation in the early years of Henry VI, have maintained the war with such stubbornness when the tide had turned in France.

Nor is there evidence of any present shortage of man-power. In 1421 Henry had taken abroad with him some 4000 men. The heavy losses during the summer and before Meaux naturally rendered necessary the despatch of reinforcements, and these began to be recruited in the following February. They were to be led by Bedford, whose place as *custos* of England was to be taken by Gloucester. Bedford himself furnished a retinue of two knights, ninety-seven men-at-arms and 300 archers², while other retinues in the force amounted to 135 men-at-arms and 424 archers³. They sailed from Southampton early in May⁴. Some weeks later Robert Lord Willoughby, with twenty-nine men-at-arms and ninety archers, crossed from Winchelsea⁵; so that the English army in France

¹ Rec. Rolls 9 and 10 Hen. V, and 1 Hen. VI, Mich. Under taxation is included £3480 from the clerical tenth of 1421. Half of the York tenth was not due till midsummer, 1423 (Fine Roll 9 Hen. V, m. 11). Of course much of the money raised by taxation was devoted to the repayment of loans.

² For. Accts. 69, F, 1; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 18, 1422.

³ For. Accts. 69, F, 1 sqq.; Brit. Mus., Stowe MS. 440, f. 44 sqq.

⁴ The exact date is not known, but the earliest letters patent attested by Gloucester are dated May 12, while the last attested by Bedford are dated May 4 (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 425).

⁵ Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., May 4, June 8, July 29, 1422; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 331; For. Accts. 69, F; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 445; Claus. 10 Hen. V, m. 5.

must altogether have been strengthened by nearly 1100 men¹. There was evidently a scarcity of captains², but there is no reason to suppose that any special difficulty was experienced in raising the men.

During the early months of 1422, the chief preoccupation of the English government seems to have been the provision of transport for the reinforcements and for Queen Catherine, who was to sail with them, leaving the infant prince behind³. Ships were already being pressed in February⁴, and during the following month they were mustering at Southampton from many English ports, while one or two foreign vessels had also been hired⁵. For some weeks the troops destined for France lay in the neighbourhood⁶; indeed Southampton was for a time the seat of government, Bedford having with him there the chancellor, the treasurer, the keeper of the privy seal, and several other members of the Council⁷. It was at Southampton that the ambassadors of the count of Foix received the money which Henry had contracted to pay their lord in the treaty made at Meaux in the previous month⁸. Catherine herself had lodging at Southwick⁹. The crossing was safely accomplished early in May, Catherine disembarking at Harfleur¹⁰.

The long-announced reform of the coinage underwent much delay, but on Feb. 13, 1422, Bartholomew Goldbeter, goldsmith, of London, was appointed master of the mints of the Tower and Calais¹¹. He undertook to coin gold nobles worth

¹ Most of the archers were mounted (Stowe MS. 440, ff. 44 sqq.).

² Many small contingents were sent "in the name" of men who presumably were unfit for military service. Thus, Thomas de Bradshaw, esquire, and Thurston de Anderton, esquire, send in their names Gilbert Donkesbury and Thomas Slake, esquire, each with three mounted archers (Stowe MS. 440, ff. 44, 44 v^o). John Hayteley and three mounted archers went in the name of a lady, Dame Beatrix Shirley (*ibid.* f. 44).

³ Brut, ii. 563; Tit. Liv. 93. Catherine's journey was decided upon by Jan. 26, when she was evidently expected to set out at once (Rym. x. 171).

⁴ Rym. x. 175; Devon, 370; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 23, 1422.

⁵ Vessels were retained in Melcombe and other western ports (Devon, 370); the Cinque Ports and London were of course drawn upon (Rym. x. 175; Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 23, March 11, 10 Hen. V, Pasch., April 20, 1422), while on the east coast Lowestoft, Yarmouth, and Alnmouth contributed a ship each (For. Accts. 69, G). Foreign vessels were furnished by Sluys, Middelburg, and Goes (*ibid.*).

⁶ Rym. x. 201.

⁷ *Ibid.* 201, 204, 205 sq.; Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., April 20, 1422; Chanc. Warr. 669/1180, 1181, 1543/70, 71; Cal. Doc. Scot. xiv. 185.

⁸ See above, p. 373.

⁹ For. Accts. 69, F v^o.

¹⁰ Kingsford, Chron. 74, 128; Brut, ii. 428, 448; Monstr. iv. 98.

¹¹ Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 2 d; Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 410; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 321.

6s. 8d., fifty pieces of which were to go to the Tower pound, and also half and quarter nobles of the same quality. He was furthermore to make the usual kinds of silver coins—groats worth 5d., half-groats, “esterlings” (to be current for 1d.), “mailles” (worth half an esterling), and “ferlings” (worth a quarter). Ninety groats were to weigh a Tower pound. The quality of both gold and silver coins was to be good¹. The manufacture of the new money seems to have proceeded slowly; a shortage of silver coins caused much inconvenience², and in the summer it was found advisable to bring coiners to the Tower from Brabant³ and even from Rouen⁴, where one would have supposed their services to be still more urgently needed. It is yet more surprising to find bullion, presumably silver, being despatched from Rouen to London, doubtless to be coined⁵.

The Church in England was fairly quiet during the last year of the reign. The convocation of York met on Sept. 22, 1421, in compliance with a royal writ of July 26. It followed the convocation of Canterbury in voting a tenth—half to be paid at midsummer, 1422, and half a year later—and was prorogued to Jan. 14, 1422. On reassembling it was concerned principally with the question of the preferment of graduates, discussed in the previous spring by the southern province, and on Jan. 22 it was ordered that constitutions on the subject should be published. They were to the same effect as the ordinance issued in the previous year by Archbishop Chichele⁶.

In the following summer, on July 6, the convocation of Canterbury again met, but no pecuniary grant to the crown was requested or made. There was some debate as to what should be

¹ “Et serront les ditz monoys dor de xxij carratz troys greins et dimy (*sic*) dor fyn et vaudray chescun liure des ditz monoys dor xvj liures xij s iij d d esterling.” “Chescun liure dargent. . . du poys tiendra xj unces et ij d d esterling du poys dargent fyn et xvij du poys dallay chescun denier contenant xxiiij grans” (*sic*). Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 2 d.

² Greg., Chron. 142.

³ Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., June 8, 1422.

⁴ Ibid. Aug. 30, 1422; Devon, 373.

⁵ Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., July 29, 1422.

⁶ Conc. iii. 403; Records of Northern Convocation, ii. 138 sqq. The grant was subject to very numerous exemptions. Total exemption was granted to all religious houses and ecclesiastical benefices in Cumberland, Northumberland, and Westmorland; to the abbey of Selby, Roche, and Meaux, ruined by floods; to several smaller houses, and to all benefices appropriated to nunneries, by reason of their notorious poverty. Partial exemption was allowed to York Minster “propter celerem constructionem et consummacionem eiusdem”; Thurgarton priory, the church of which was threatened with ruin; the priories of Nostell, Pontefract, and Blyth, burdened with debt; and Cockersand priory, almost destroyed by the sea (Fine Roll 9 Hen. V, m. 11).

done towards paying the expenses of the English representatives at the General Council which was to meet in 1423, and it was unanimously resolved that a contribution of threepence in the pound should be levied on church property which was assessed for clerical tenths¹.

Convocation was called upon to deal with two insubordinate clerks. One, Henry Webb of Bath Easton, confessed that he had exercised priestly functions without being duly ordained. On his submitting himself to correction, the archbishop, with the approval of those present, sentenced him to be flogged at the head of a procession, once through London, once through Worcester, once through Bath. He was removed in the custody of the bishop of Worcester.

The other offender, William White, chaplain, had preached without licence at Tenterden church, Kent, had been arrested by order of the archbishop, and had been long imprisoned, though Chichele had released him from the sentence of excommunication which he had incurred. In the presence of convocation White admitted that he was reputed to be tainted with error, heresy, and Lollardy. It was resolved that he should formally abjure all error and heresy, after doing which he would be liable to the penalties of relapse if he again fell into heterodoxy. White took the required oath, and was then presumably released, though he was destined to die a heretic's death some years later².

Apart from the adventures of Thomas Payne, little was heard of the Lollards at this time. John Prest, formerly vicar of Chesterton, Warwickshire, was pardoned for having harboured Oldcastle there in August, 1415³, and had to give and find security that he would not maintain unorthodox opinions and would appear before the Council when summoned⁴. John Reynald, too—a tailor, apparently of London—had to furnish similar guarantees that henceforth he would not be of the covin of John Oldcastle, or uphold any of his opinions, but would be loyal to the king and come before the Council if required⁵. It is strange to find what a bogey Oldcastle still was, even when he had been dead four years.

¹ Conc. iii. 404.

² Ibid.

³ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 371.

⁴ Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 14 d.

⁵ "Quod ipse de assensu et couina Johannis Oldecastell nuper proditoris. . . exnunc minime erit aut aliquas oppiniones (*sic*) ipsius Johannis Oldecastell palam vel occulte. . . predicabit, revelabit, docebet (*sic*), aut tenebit et quod. . . tanquam verus ligeus Regis

During the last fifteen months of the reign there was but one vacancy of an episcopal see. This was caused by the death of Robert Clifford, bishop of London. The dean and chapter received royal licence to elect a successor on Nov. 9, 1421¹; but before their choice could have been known at Rome, Martin V had translated to the vacant see John Kemp, bishop of Chichester², who, as we have seen, was also chancellor of Normandy. Thomas Polton was translated from Hereford to Chichester, and Thomas Spofford, who had lately been provided to Rochester but had never entered into possession of that see, was translated to Hereford, John Langdon, a monk of Canterbury, being provided to Rochester³. These appointments were presumably agreeable to the king, and they must have been very lucrative to the pope. Apart from bishoprics, however, the pope's influence on the English Church was not marked. Abbeys and priories that fell vacant were filled by canonical election, which was confirmed by the ordinary and assented to by the king⁴. So far as is known, no other ecclesiastical dignities or benefices were filled by papal provision during this time⁵. That the Statute of Provisors was still being strictly enforced in respect of lesser dignities and benefices appears not merely from these facts but also from the continued efforts of Martin V to secure the repeal of the obnoxious legislation⁶.

exnunc. . . se habebit et quod. . . personaliter comparebit coram dicto domino Rege et consilio suo infra xv dies postquam ipse seu aliquis manucaptorum suorum premunitus fuerit" (Claus. 9 Hen. V, m. 10 d).

¹ Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 403.

² Cal. Pap. Lett. vii. 161. The bull of translation was dated Nov. 17.

³ Ibid. 161, 214. Spofford, before being provided to Rochester, was abbot of St Mary's, York (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 403).

⁴ For examples, see Cal. Pat. 1416-22, pp. 393, 394, 395, 400, 402, 403, 408, 410, 413, 415, 426, 427.

⁵ It is worthy of note that John Ixworth, who had been provided to the canonry and prebend of Biggleswade by the pope and collated to it by the bishop of Lincoln, successfully petitioned Martin that he might use the latter title as justification for his possession of the benefice (Cal. Pap. Lett. vii. 213).

⁶ See above, pp. 375 sqq.

CHAPTER LXXV

“IN MANUS TUAS, DOMINE”

HENRY seems to have remained at Meaux for some time after the surrender of the Market, and it was not until May 26 that news of Queen Catherine's approach took him to Bois de Vincennes¹. Catherine, who had made a leisurely journey from the coast², arrived on the same day: her father and mother had been lodging there for some time³. On May 30, Henry and Catherine entered Paris, the king characteristically visiting Notre Dame before going to his quarters at the Louvre⁴. Charles VI and Queen Isabel came on the same day, and lodged at the Hôtel St Pol⁵. Next day was Whitsun, and the two kings celebrated the feast in their respective quarters. Henry, with Catherine and many notable Englishmen, dined publicly in great state, though, to the disgust of the Parisians, the spectators got nothing to eat or drink. As at Christmas a year and a half before, the contrast between Henry's splendour and Charles's lack of pomp and company filled many Frenchmen with grief; but the French nobles did nothing to comfort their king in his distress⁶.

On June 2 and 3, Henry and Catherine, escorted by many nobles and ladies, French and English, went to the Hôtel de Nesle to see the Mystery of the Life of St George, which had been staged for their entertainment by some of the citizens of Paris⁷. On the second day of the performance the Hôtel de Nesle was the scene of an important council at which were present the dukes of Bedford and Exeter, the earl of March, the chancellor of Normandy with the bishop of Coutances and Raoul le Sage, Arthur of Richemont, the chancellor of France, Philippe de Morvilliers, and the bishops of Théroouanne and Beauvais, to mention no others⁸. It seems to have been the

¹ In the following paragraphs, I have adopted the dates given by Fauquembergue.

² She had arrived at Rouen on May 14 (Cochon, 288).

³ Fauquembergue, ii. 49 sq.

⁴ Ibid. 50; Cordeliers, 317; Monstr. iv. 99.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Brut, ii. 492; Monstr. iv. 99; Chast. i. 310 sq.

⁷ Fauquembergue, ii. 50 sq.; Bourgeois, 174.

⁸ Fauquembergue, ii. 51.

first and only occasion on which a joint council, representative of England, France, and Normandy, was held.

Henry was cordially welcomed on his return to Paris¹, and according to one authority his vigorous administration of justice maintained his popularity with the poor². On the other hand, his efforts to collect the silver which had been voted by the Estates, together with new regulations about the currency, caused much murmuring, though the "Bourgeois," as usual, puts the blame on the dauphinists³.

It had apparently been decided that Henry was to go to Picardy and crush Jacques d'Harcourt once for all. While in Paris he wrote to the towns of the *bailliages* of Amiens and Vermandois, asking whether they would be willing to supply his army with provisions at prices which he named. Failing an agreement, he hinted, the English army would be employed elsewhere, leaving the regions in question still exposed to the depredations of Harcourt. Henry's messengers, however, were well received, and returned with satisfactory reports⁴. The earl of Warwick was already operating in Vimeu, and on June 11 the garrison and the citizens of Gamaches agreed to surrender both town and castle on the following day. Louis Bournel the captain and any who wished might go beyond the Seine to dauphinist regions, taking with them their personal property, provided that subjects of Henry, all who had sworn to the treaty of Troyes, and anyone concerned in the murder of Montereau should be handed over; the rest, on taking the customary oath, should be pardoned and restored to their property⁵. Warwick then went forward to lay siege to St Valéry-sur-Somme⁶.

On June 11 Henry and Catherine left Paris for St Denis, on the way to Compiègne, where the garrison was shortly to surrender the town⁷. On the next day, accompanied by Charles VI

¹ Cordeliers, 317.

² Fenin, 182.

³ Monstr. iv. 100 sq.; Chast. i. 313; Bourgeois, 161 sqq.

⁴ Tit. Liv. 95; Cochon, 288. Livius quotes what purports to be the letter written by Henry to the *bailliages* of Amiens and Vermandois; but if he did not make it up altogether, he certainly edited it drastically. The need for Henry's enquiry was shown by the fact that Amiens refused to furnish men at its own expense for the siege of St Valéry (Durand, iv. 95).

⁵ Monstr. iv. 98, 101; Le Fèvre, ii. 55; Chast. i. 314; Fenin, App. 302 sqq. The surrender of Gamaches does not seem to have been involved in the terms of the capitulation of the Market of Meaux.

⁶ Monstr. iv. 101; Durand, iv. 95.

⁷ Fauquembergue, ii. 51.

and Isabel, they went on to Senlis¹, where part of Henry's household had arrived some time before². In a day or two, however, he was recalled to Paris by news of the discovery of a plot. An armourer, his wife, and a baker, who dwelt at La Heaumerie, having fallen under suspicion, were arrested, and the woman confessed that they had been concerned in a conspiracy to deliver Paris to the dauphinists. It was currently believed that a body of malcontents in the city were to have opened the gates to the garrison of Compiègne, as they were withdrawing southward after their surrender, and that the scheme explained the readiness with which they had yielded a place capable of holding out for a year. At all events, Henry returned with an armed force, and had the woman and some of her accomplices drowned³.

Henry went back to Senlis⁴ and thence at last visited Compiègne⁵, which had duly surrendered on the 18th, the lord of Gamaches, with the garrison, departing to dauphinist country beyond the Seine⁶ and making no attempt to annoy Paris now that their plot—if plot there was—had been exploded. From Compiègne, however, instead of going north against Harcourt, the king returned to Senlis⁷, perhaps recalled by bad news from the south.

It will be remembered that after his campaign in Vimeu in the spring, John of Luxemburg had ordered the troops under his command to reassemble at Péronne towards the end of May in order to reduce the troublesome castle of Moy. Before the date fixed, however, the dauphinists, no doubt influenced by the fall of Meaux, had evacuated Moy and several neighbouring strongholds, after setting them on fire. The rendezvous was therefore changed to Le Cateau-Cambrésis, and the date to June 15. Then John was summoned urgently to Paris, and it was announced that the force was to muster on June 26 at Bray-sur-Somme, where the duke of Burgundy himself, who

¹ Bourgeois, 174.

² William Philip had received money there on June 5 (For. Accts. 69, F).

³ Monstr. iv. 104 sq.; Cordeliers, 318; Bourgeois, 174 sq. An examination of Henry's movements at this time shows that the plot must have been discovered before Henry's visit to Compiègne, notwithstanding Monstrelet's testimony.

⁴ Longnon, 45; D.K.R. xlii. 433, 444; Rym. x. 223; Monstr. iv. 105.

⁵ Monstr. iv. 104; Vita, 329; Tit. Liv. 94.

⁶ Monstr. iv. 103; Sorel, La Prise de Jeanne Darc, 51, n. 2, 321. They passed through Mantes, conducted by the *bailli* of Gisors (Grave, Arch. municip. de Mantes, 19).

⁷ D.K.R. xlii. 443, 450; Douët d'Arcq, i. 429.

was bringing many other troops, was to assume command¹. The result of these delays was that the Burgundians lost the initiative. The soldiers, many of whom had been kept under arms by their captains, did much mischief, especially in Artois², and the only exploit of note accomplished at this time was the capture of the town of St Dizier in Champagne by Jean and Antoine de Vergy, who afterwards beat off an attempt by La Hire to relieve the castle, which eventually fell in August³.

Meanwhile all the plans of Henry and Philip had been upset by a dauphinist offensive against the county of Nevers. It was a shrewd stroke, for it threatened to cut communications between Dijon and Paris. By June 20 the dauphinists were besieging La Charité-sur-Loire in force⁴, under the viscount of Narbonne and Tanneguy du Chastel⁵. Some attempt at relief was made, probably by troops raised locally⁶, and the duke, who was at Troyes on his way northward after his visit to Burgundy and Savoy, turned back and went to Dijon, whence he appealed for help to the dukes of Savoy and Lorraine⁷. His preparations were hindered by a mutiny of Burgundian troops in Charolais, who had received no pay for a long time⁸. Before they were pacified, La Charité fell⁹. The dauphinists might have been well advised to push on into the county of Nevers, but instead Charles, who had established his headquarters at Sancerre¹⁰, ordered siege to be laid to Cosne¹¹, a few miles distant. The dauphinists were in great strength¹², and the garrison soon agreed to surrender unless relieved by Aug. 12, hostages being given as a guarantee of good faith¹³. Messages passed between the dauphin and duke Philip, who agreed to fight a battle on the day fixed for the surrender at a place near Cosne on the right bank of the Loire¹⁴.

¹ Cordeliers, 316.

² Ibid. 317.

³ Ibid. 318 sq.; Monstr. iv. 105; Plancher, iii. 58.

⁴ Letter of the dauphin to the marshal de Severac, in Beaucourt, i. 470; Monstr. iv. 106; Cordeliers, 318.

⁵ Cousinot, 185.

⁶ Beaucourt, i. 470.

⁷ Plancher, iii. 54 sq.

⁸ Ibid. 56.

⁹ Cousinot, 185; Monstr. iv. 106.

¹⁰ Cordeliers, 319; Monstr. iv. 106.

¹¹ Ibid.; Le Fèvre, ii. 59; Tit. Liv. 94; Vita, 329.

¹² Cordeliers, 319, 321; Monstr. iv. 106; Vita, 329.

¹³ Cousinot, 185; Bourgeois, 175 sq.; Cordeliers, 321. Various dates are given for the surrender, but the three independent authorities cited agree on Aug. 12, which accords well with the movements of the Anglo-Burgundian relief force as given by Plancher (iii. 58).

¹⁴ Cousinot, 185; Bouvier, 442; Cordeliers, 321; Monstr. iv. 106; Le Fèvre, ii. 60; Fenin, 184; Bourgeois, 176; Durand, iv. 96.

The duke had summoned troops from all parts of his territories, but, being weak in infantry, he asked Henry for a contingent of archers¹. The king replied that he would join Philip in person with all his available men².

In the second half of July the English force was joined near Paris by the lord of Croy and Hue de Lannoy, with 300 men-at-arms from Artois, while John of Luxemburg, who had just recovered from small-pox, brought a contingent from Picardy³. Henry, who was very sick, came from Bois de Vincennes and attempted to lead the army, but was obliged to turn back at Corbeil⁴. Bedford was put in command of the force, and, accompanied by Exeter, led it to Vézelay, where the duke of Burgundy joined them on Aug. 4 with the troops he had raised in his southern territories⁵. The combined forces were very powerful, forming a greater army than any that Duke John had ever put into the field⁶. As the dauphinists were also very numerous, everything seemed to presage a great and decisive battle, news of which was anxiously awaited far and wide⁷. The Anglo-Burgundian army advanced on Cosne. To obviate the jealousy which had manifested itself on some previous occasions, there were English, Picards, and Burgundians in each of its divisions—vaward, “battle,” and rearguard⁸. It arrived before Cosne on Aug. 11⁹, and early next day the advance-guard, under John of Luxemburg, was on the ground selected for the battle, the centre, under the duke himself and Bedford, following at once¹⁰. The whole army waited till three hours after dinner, but no enemy appeared, and scouts brought word that the dauphinist

¹ Cordeliers, 319, 321; Monstr. iv. 106.

² Ibid. 106 sqq.; Le Fèvre, ii. 60.

³ Cordeliers, 317, 320 sq.; Monstr. iv. 107; Fenin, 184.

⁴ Vita, 330; Tit. Liv. 95; Cousinot, 185; Bouvier, 442; Monstr. iv. 107.

⁵ Vita, 330; Wals. ii. 343; Tit. Liv. 95; Cordeliers, 320; Monstr. iv. 107; Fenin, 184; G. de Roze, 186; Bouvier, 442; Plancher, iii. 58.

⁶ Cordeliers, 321; Le Fèvre, ii. 61. Fenin (185) says that the Anglo-Burgundian army numbered 12,000 men, a credible figure, and (184) estimates the English contingent at 3000.

⁷ For the interest shown at the French court, see Douët d'Arcq, Comptes, 284. At Paris the body of St Geneviève was carried in procession to the cathedral with the object of aiding the Anglo-Burgundian cause (Grassoreille, 149, n. 1). Amiens sent a messenger to Paris to find out what had really been arranged (Durand, iv. 96). On Aug. 12 a Mass of the Holy Spirit was sung at Troyes after a general procession “pour la bataille qui devait faire Mons. de Bourgogne contre les Armignacs (*sic*) à Cone” (Arbois de Jubainville, Sér. G, i. p. viii).

⁸ Monstr. iv. 108; Cordeliers, 321.

⁹ Plancher, iii. 58.

¹⁰ Cordeliers, 321 sq.

troops had been disbanded¹. Certain of them, however, were to be seen on the other side of the river, and a few tried to cross, but were driven back by the English archers². Some of the besiegers remained on the left bank of the Loire for two days. But they did not offer battle, recognising their small chance of success, and eventually acknowledged their defeat by giving back the hostages they had received from Cosne³. For their part, the Burgundians and English were evidently at a loss, and made no attempt to cross the river and invade dauphinist territory⁴. On the third day, John of Luxemburg was sent to raid in the direction of La Charité, but dauphinist troops moved up the opposite bank watching him, and after reaching the town he fell back on the main army⁵. The duke of Burgundy then thanked those who had come to his aid, bestowed gifts upon their leaders, and ordered a general withdrawal. Philip led the Burgundians back into the duchy, while the English and Picards went northward under Bedford, suffering much from hunger until they neared Troyes, when they spread themselves over the country and greatly annoyed the inhabitants. At Troyes the Picards and the English parted amicably, the former going home, the latter towards Paris⁶. Bedford, on arriving at Troyes, had received news about the king which caused him to hasten forward to Bois de Vincennes⁷.

Cosne had been saved, and the dauphinist army had dispersed. On the whole, however, the honours of the campaign

¹ Cordeliers, 322. Cf. Monstr. iv. 108; Bourgeois, 176; Vita, 330; Tit. Liv. 94; Wals. ii. 343.

² G. de Roye, 186.

³ Cousinot, 185; Bouvier, 443; Raoulet, 171.

⁴ Cousinot, 185. According to Vita, 330, Bedford was under orders to lead his men back to Henry as soon as the relief of Cosne was accomplished.

⁵ Cousinot, 186; Bouvier, 442 sq.; Fenin, 185.

⁶ Monstr. iv. 108; Le Fèvre, ii. 61; Chast. i. 327; Plancher, iii. 58. In and around Paris at the end of August there are known to have been nearly 1300 English combatants (Exch. Accts. 50/12, 13, 17). Seven retinues which had been mustered at Meaux towards the end of March (Exch. Accts. 50/15) were also mustered at Paris in the last days of August (Exch. Accts. 50/12, 17). In March they numbered altogether 619 (197 + 422), in August 596 (190 + 406). The whole decrease is more than accounted for by the drop in Exeter's numbers from 275 to 235. Most of the other retinues had grown. Drafts from England to the several captains might account for this: but it is probable that many of the small contingents brought over by Bedford had been put under experienced leaders. The retinues of Bedford himself, Willoughby, and one or two others were, however, maintained intact (Exch. Accts. 50/12, 13, 17). There is no indication how many retinues had been to Cosne. From other sources we know that Bedford and Exeter had been there, and it is perhaps significant that the losses of both had been heavy, Bedford's 399 having been reduced to 306 since his landing (Exch. Accts. 50/17).

⁷ Monstr. iv. 109; Chast. i. 327; Plancher, iii. 58.

rested with the dauphinists. They still held La Charité, which constituted a valuable bridgehead on the right bank of the Loire and gave them a good *point d'appui* for attacks on the county of Nevers or the duchy of Burgundy itself. And they had entirely upset the plans of King Henry and Duke Philip. Jacques d'Harcourt was still in possession of Le Crotoy, whence he was not to be dislodged till 1424. The siege of St Valéry-sur-Somme, it is true, had ended satisfactorily for the English. The garrison at first showed a high spirit, and Warwick's advance-guard was handled very roughly; but on the arrival of his main force the defenders were driven within the walls. Warwick lodged in the abbey, and most of his men lay in tents. The English opened a heavy bombardment and broke down the walls in several places; but the dauphinists made many sorties, and, being at first blockaded merely on the landward side, could resort to Le Crotoy and other ports for supplies. Warwick, however, sending for ships to Normandy, soon cut them off entirely from their friends, and after this the garrison speedily lost heart, and about the beginning of July made an agreement to surrender the place on Sept. 4 unless the dauphin should make a serious attempt at their relief before then. Meanwhile, they were not to raid in the neighbourhood. Having received hostages, Warwick, instead of attacking Le Crotoy, led his force to the king¹, and according to some authorities took part in the relief of Cosne². St Valéry, in accordance with the capitulation, was delivered to the English on Sept. 4³; but that date falls in the reign of Henry VI.

This success, however, was in some measure counterbalanced by a regrettable incident in Normandy. It was always hard to protect the frontiers of the duchy, and the inhabitants of the county of Ivry were so harassed by raids of the dauphinist

¹ Monstr. iv. 101 sqq.; Chast. i. 316; Cordeliers, 318, 320. The date of the capitulation is uncertain. The Cordeliers chronicle, a good authority on points of chronology, dates it (320) in July, and Monstrelet says (iv. 102) that the siege lasted three weeks. It was still in progress on June 29 (Rot. Norm. 10 Hen. V, m. 15 d. This document is badly mistranslated in D.K.R. xlii. 450).

It seems likely that Warwick's orders to rejoin Henry came unexpectedly, for on July 7 it was apparently believed in Rouen that Warwick's force was besieging Le Crotoy (For. Accts. 69, F v^o, G. The date is given as in 9 Hen. V, but this is obviously a slip). That Warwick's force had been destined for this operation is indicated by the fact that Henry and Charles VI had sent to Jacques d'Harcourt an embassy consisting of his brother the bishop of Amiens, Pierre Cauchon bishop of Beauvais, and Hue de Lannoy, who demanded the surrender of Le Crotoy. Negotiations followed, but no agreement was reached (Monstr. iv. 103 sq.).

² Monstr. iv. 107; Wals. ii. 343.

³ Cordeliers, 323.

garrisons of Perche and the Chartrain that in July the collectors of the *taille* were instructed to leave them in peace until next Christmas¹. Yet there was frequent temptation to use the men of the garrisons for service in the field; it was believed that many had been sent to join the Cosne relief force², and it is true that on Aug. 9 the captains of a number of strong places in Lower Normandy and Perche, including Domfront, Falaise, Verneuil, and Évreux, were ordered to despatch troops to reinforce Ralph Butler at Eu³. This was a piece of luck for the viscount of Narbonne and the count of Aumale, Jean d'Har-court, who were on the point of attacking Normandy with a force which had been assembled in Maine. Just as everyone's attention was turned towards Cosne, they broke across the frontier. They got as far as Bernay without meeting serious opposition, and the English garrison, which evacuated the place on their approach, was pursued and scattered with heavy loss. Next day, having thoroughly pillaged the town, the raiders withdrew southward with their booty⁴. Meanwhile an English knight, Philip Branch⁵, had mustered a strong body of troops, and he now followed in close pursuit. A skirmish at Moulins-la-Marche failed to arrest the retreat of the French, but some miles farther, near Mortagne, they were constrained to turn and fight. The English dismounted and drew up their line behind a palisade of stakes, but on being charged they broke and fled. They lost heavily, both in killed and in prisoners. The French went on their way with their plunder, and though they were still well within English territory there was no further attempt to stop them⁶. The episode, while not of the first importance, showed how difficult it was to protect Normandy against dauphinist captains who possessed a little resolution. The raid was evidently very well timed and executed⁷.

¹ Bibl. nat., MS. franç. 26,044/5740.

² Bourgeois, 176.

³ Rot. Norm. 10 Hen. V, m. 9 d. They were to be with Butler by Aug. 30.

⁴ St Denys, vi. 474 sqq.; Juv. 567; Cagny, 124; Cousinot, 186 sq.; J. Chartier, in Bull. Soc. Hist. France, 1858, pp. 231 sq.

⁵ For Branch, see D.K.R. xli. 791, xlii. 406. He was presumably identical with Philip Braunche, knight, of Fleet, Lincs. (Cal. Pat. 1416-22, p. 160).

⁶ St Denys, vi. 476 sqq.; Cagny, 125; Cousinot, 187; J. Chartier, in Bull. Soc. Hist. France, 1858, pp. 232 sqq. The St Denis chronicler says that after the fight the French betook themselves with their plunder to the neighbouring town of Mortagne. If this is true, it is striking evidence of the weakness of the English defences near the southern frontier of Normandy.

⁷ Professor Newhall (290 sq.) places the incident in November, 1422, but I am not convinced by his arguments in support of this date. The St Denis chronicler, followed

But operations against Harcourt and raids on Normandy were of little moment compared with the sickness of King Henry. Early in the year his health had given cause for concern, and an English physician had been summoned to Meaux¹. There is no sign, however, that Henry's ailment, whatever it was, seriously impaired his mental and physical vigour until the siege of Meaux was over. The weather in June was very hot², and this may have had something to do with the removal of the two courts of Henry and Charles VI from Paris to Senlis, though an epidemic of small-pox was probably a more powerful motive³. It has been thought that Henry's health was broken by incessant anxiety, warfare, and hardship⁴; but that opinion seems to be based on mere surmise. Henry doubtless had led an active and harassing life; but he was by all accounts a man of cool and confident disposition, not at all likely to succumb to nervous strain or mental worry. As for the hardships he had endured, they were not very great. After all, he had seen little actual campaigning. A good deal of his time in France had been given to diplomacy. His military operations consisted mainly of sieges, and when he personally took part in these, he was of course lodged in fairly comfortable quarters. Much has been said of the sufferings of the English at the siege of Meaux, and they were doubtless considerable; yet we have seen reason to think that the losses from sickness were small, and it must be remembered that the king was housed in the large abbey of St Faro, surrounded by a great part of his household staff⁵. Of course Henry always took an active interest in the conduct of operations under his direction, and at Meaux, as elsewhere, he must have been frequently exposed to danger of wounds or death; but that he ran greater risk from “natural causes” while before Meaux than he would have done in Paris or London, it is impossible to prove. Physically, his most trying experience after the march to Agincourt was probably the campaign of the summer of 1421; he must to some extent have suffered from the hardships that afflicted his men; and it may be that they left behind a gastric or intestinal weakness

by JuvénaI, and Cagny expressly ascribe the raid to August, the last, indeed, giving a precise date, the 14th, for the action near Mortagne. Such evidence must hold good against the vagueness of the other authorities, whose chronology is invariably loose.

¹ Iss. Roll 9 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 3, 1422.

² Bourgeois, 175.

⁴ Vickers, 382; Kingsford, 378.

³ Ibid.

⁵ See above, p. 339.

which rendered him an easy prey to dysentery or kindred diseases. Walsingham, an excellent authority on contemporary opinion in England, says that the fatal illness grew out of a long-standing distemper¹. Nevertheless, in June Henry was projecting a campaign against Jacques d'Harcourt², and no one seems to have had any misgivings about his health until he returned to Senlis after his visit to Compiègne³. Then, however, he must have felt seriously ill; for though he made light of it in public⁴, he summoned a new physician from England⁵ and on July 7 moved to the castle of Vincennes, while next day the University of Paris, of course with his knowledge, took part in processions for the prosperity of the realm and the safety and recovery of the king of England⁶. It was popularly believed that Henry had small-pox⁷, and few can have known that he was dangerously sick until he attempted to lead the Cosne relief force. He could not ride, and had to be carried in a horse-litter. Even so, it took several days to convey him to Corbeil, and farther he was unable to go⁸. At Corbeil he seems to have remained for more than a fortnight⁹. An improvement in his state was soon followed by a relapse, and it was resolved to take him back to Bois de Vincennes. He was rowed down the Seine to Charenton, where, wishing to reassure public opinion, he left the boat and essayed to ride, but was fain to dismount after a few paces. Thence to the castle he had to resort to the horse-litter, and at his journey's end he took to his bed, which he was never to leave¹⁰.

From this time, Aug. 13¹¹, to his death eighteen days later, there seems never to have been serious hope of his recovery¹². The nature of his disorder is vaguely and contradictorily

¹ Wals. ii. 343.

² See above, p. 407.

³ Vita, 329; Monstr. iv. 107. No chronicler suggests that anything was seriously wrong before.

⁴ Vita, 329.

⁵ Master John Swanwyth, M.B. (Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., July 14, 1422).

⁶ Fauquembergue, ii. 52 sq.

⁷ Bourgeois, 175.

⁸ Vita, 330. That Henry could not go beyond Corbeil is also stated by Tit. Liv. 95; Cochon, 288; and Norm. Chron. (Hellot), 69, all of whom think that sickness first overtook him there.

⁹ D.K.R. xlii. 445; Rym. x. 234 sq.; Fauquembergue, ii. 56.

¹⁰ Vita, 331; Monstr. iv. 108.

¹¹ Fauquembergue, ii. 56.

¹² It can hardly have been later than Aug. 20 that Bedford heard at Troyes the news which caused him to hasten to Bois de Vincennes, for duke Philip reached Troyes later, spent eight days there, but did not hear that Henry was dying until he was on his way thence to Paris (Fenin, 185; cf. above, p. 411).

indicated by the chroniclers. Walsingham calls it dysentery¹, and descriptions of the symptoms in other writers confirm the diagnosis, even when they use other names². If dysentery it was, the long resistance to it which Henry offered testifies to the strength of his constitution, and tells against the theory that he had long been in weak health.

Up to Aug. 30 Henry was able to transact business³. He had his household at Bois de Vincennes, and Bedford, Exeter, and Warwick reached the castle some time before the end⁴. The duke of Burgundy evidently wished to avoid meeting him again; for, on hearing that Henry was at the point of death, he contented himself with sending Hue de Lannoy to his bedside, though he was no farther away than Brie-comte-Robert⁵. Queen Catherine was still at Senlis with her parents⁶, and Henry seems to have betrayed no affection or concern for her during his last hours. He thought only of politics and his soul.

On Aug. 30, feeling his end to be near, Henry called to his bedside Bedford, Exeter, Warwick, Lewis Robsart, and a few others, Englishmen, in whom he had special confidence⁷. He told them that he knew death to be at hand. If he had wronged any man, which he did not believe, he asked pardon. He thanked all present and their fellow-soldiers for their services, which he would have fitly rewarded had he lived longer. He exhorted them to continue the war until all France had accepted the treaty of Troyes, protesting that he had invaded France for no worldly ambition but for the maintenance of his just claims, as saintly and wise men had told him he might do. Bedford he wished to have the custody of Normandy until

¹ Wals. ii. 343.

² “Et, comme je fus assez veritablement informe, la principale maladie dont ledit roy Henry ala de vie a trespas lui vint par feu qui le feri par dessousz ou fondement, assex semblable au feu qu'on dit de saint-Anthoine” (Monstr. iv. 113). St Anthony's Fire, however, is now another name for erysipelas and in the Middle Ages was a synonym for the *maladie ardente*, a very prevalent disease, resembling erysipelas, but now apparently extinct. The Monk of St Denis (vi. 480) ascribes Henry's death to an “*infirmetas fluxus ventris*,” while Juvénal des Ursins (567) speaks of “*un flux de ventre merveilleux, avec hemorrhoides*.”

³ Rym. x. 259.

⁴ För. Accts. 69, F v^o; Exch. Accts. 50/12, 13, 17; Vita, 332; Monstr. iv. 109.

⁵ Fenin, 185; Monstr. iv. 111, 112.

⁶ Ibid. 107, 113; Cordeliers, 322. The Cordeliers chronicle, however, says (320) that Catherine had visited Henry after his return to Bois de Vincennes from Corbeil. This is denied by Monstrelet (iv. 107). Livius (95) says that Charles VI and the two queens were at Bois de Vincennes when Henry died. This is most improbable. In any case, Catherine does not figure in any account of Henry's last moments.

⁷ Vita, 332; Monstr. iv. 109.

Henry VI should reach years of discretion¹. He was, too, to hold the regency of France, unless Burgundy was willing to undertake it². Gloucester was to be protector of England³; but Exeter⁴ and Walter Hungerford⁵ were to have personal charge of the little king. Dissension with Burgundy was to be avoided at all costs⁶. The duke of Orléans, the count of Eu, and two or three other prisoners must on no account be released until Henry VI came of age. Other captives Bedford might treat as he liked⁷. No treaty with the dauphinists must be made except on condition that Normandy remained in English hands⁸.

After showing his will to those present⁹ and conversing for a short while with Hue de Lannoy¹⁰, Henry called his physicians, and asked how long he had to live. At first they put him off with talk of God's restoring him to health; but when he insisted on hearing the truth, they gave him no more than two

¹ Vita, 332 sq.

² This is well attested. I have adopted Monstrelet's version (iv. 110), which is followed by Le Fèvre (ii. 62) and Chastellain (i. 328), who adds that after Henry's death Bedford offered the regency to Burgundy, who refused it (i. 331 sq.). Confirmation of these Burgundian authorities is afforded by Walsingham (ii. 345), who evidently thought that Burgundy had accepted the regency. The author of the Vita mentions only England and Normandy, and his omission of any reference to Henry's wishes respecting the French regency may perhaps reflect the fact that they indicated confidence in Burgundy, who was hated in England after 1435.

³ Vita, 333; Tit. Liv. 95. Both these authorities had strong reasons to give prominence to Duke Humphrey. Brut (ii. 431) says that Henry named him protector and defender of the realm, but the information is inserted apparently as an afterthought and is not given as part of the king's dying speech. The "Southern Chronicle" printed by Mr Kingsford (Lit. 278) says that Henry entrusted the government of England to Bedford, Gloucester, Exeter, and Bishop Beaufort, and that these four, with consent of parliament, ordained that Bedford should be *custos* of Normandy and Gloucester *custos* of England. The Burgundian writers say nothing of Gloucester when summarising Henry V's last wishes, but state that Exeter was to be regent in England (Monstr. iv. 110; Le Fèvre, ii. 62; Chast. i. 328 sq.). Walsingham (ii. 345) suggests that Gloucester presided at Henry VI's first parliament in virtue of his commission to act as *custos* granted by Henry V in the previous spring. Gloucester's claim (Rot. Parl. iv. 326) that the government of England had been left to him in Henry's will was of course unfounded.

⁴ Vita, 333; Tit. Liv. 95; Monstr. iv. 110; Brut, ii. 429, 431; Kingsford, Lit. 295.

⁵ Vita, 333; the only authority to mention Hungerford. Monstrelet (iv. 110) has it that the earl of Warwick was to be Henry's tutor; but Warwick spent most of the next years in France. Other authorities associate Bishop Beaufort with Exeter (Brut, ii. 429, 431; Kingsford, Lit. 295).

⁶ Monstr. iv. 110 sq.; Fenin, 186. The form in which this advice is said to have been given is clearly a reflection of later events.

⁷ Monstr. iv. 110 sq.; Le Fèvre, ii. 62.

⁸ Monstr. iv. 110.

⁹ Apparently his first will, relating to his personal effects. See i. 539 sqq.

¹⁰ Monstr. iv. 111; Chast. i. 329; Fenin, 185. Lannoy forthwith went back to Duke Philip.

hours. He then ordered his confessor and other clergy of his household to say the seven penitential psalms¹. At the words "muri Jerusalem" in the fifty-first psalm, he stopped them, and said, "O good Lord, thou knowest that mine intent hath been, and yet is, if I might live, to re-edify the walls of Jerusalem²." Having spoken thus, he suffered them to continue³. Afterwards he received the communion and extreme unction. When his end was plainly at hand, he cried out, "Thou liest, thou liest, my portion is with the Lord Jesus Christ," and then, grasping the crucifix, he recited in a loud voice, "In manus tuas, Domine, ipsum terminum redemisti," and, with a gentle gesture as though commending his spirit to his Saviour, he passed away peacefully, like one who fell asleep⁴. It was a little after two in the morning of Monday, Aug. 31⁵.

The English and the earlier Burgundian chroniclers have of course much to say of the grief felt by the people of England and Burgundian France⁶. More impressive are the tributes to his ability and character paid by dauphinist writers⁷. Notwithstanding the assertion of Percival de Cagny that his death was concealed for fifteen days⁸, the English authorities seem to have made no mystery of it; at all events it was known in Flanders by Sept. 7⁹. Nevertheless, legends soon grew around it. In Flanders it was believed that Henry had died of leprosy¹⁰. In French circles unfriendly to the English it was told that he had resolved to move the relics of St Fiacre to England from the famous shrine near Meaux, and that he was stricken with sickness as a punishment, the name "St Fiacre's sickness" being apparently invented as a title for the disease that carried him off¹¹. The story perhaps had some slight foundation in fact,

¹ Monstr. iv. 112; Fenin, 186.

² Brut, ii. 493. Words to similar effect are reported by Monstrelet (iv. 112).

³ Monstr. iv. 112.

⁴ Vita, 334 sq.

⁵ Rym. x. 253; Fauquembergue, ii. 56. These two authorities are conclusive as to the date and time of Henry's death. It is correctly dated in Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 3; Vita, 334, 357; Brut (Contin. H), ii. 563; Kingsford, Chron. 74, 128; Monstr. iv. 112; Bourgeois, 176; St Denys, vi. 480; Juv. 567; Cochon, 288.

⁶ The Cordeliers Chron. (322) and Fenin (186) are particularly emphatic about the regret felt in France.

⁷ These will be considered below.

⁸ Cagny, 126.

⁹ Morosini, ii. 222.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ St Denys, vi. 480; Juv. 567. Both say that he died of St Fiacre's disease; but I have been unable to trace the existence of any such ailment before this time. Chastellain (i. 339), who represents a mingling of Burgundian and Armagnac traditions, says that Henry was seized with the disease which "aulcuns dient de Saint Fyacre, aucuns de Saint Anthoine," the latter name being derived by him from Monstrelet (iv. 113;

but one may probably trace its origin to the coincidence that St Fiacre's Day, Aug. 30, was the last of his life.

More than a generation later, Chastellain, who while hostile to the English tries to be just to Henry, told a strange story, which he had from the lord of la Trémoille. About a year before his death, Henry was visited by a hermit¹, who had, he said, been ordered by a messenger from God to bid him cease from afflicting the French and approve himself the champion of the faith. The hermit added that when Henry, as prince of Wales, had been wounded in the forehead while fighting against heretics in England, God had chosen him to be His instrument against the infidels. He had been suffered to proceed thus far in France, but if he went farther his life would be cut short. Henry, after some hesitation, resolved to ignore the hermit's words, and dismissed him with an ambiguous reply; but before leaving, the hermit, perceiving the state of the king's mind, warned him that he would be punished by death within a year. The visitant departed, no one knowing whence he had come or whither he had gone; but when Henry fell sick, repented, and desired to see him again, he reappeared, and in reply to the king's enquiries said that God's mercy was infinite but that, for his unbelief and disobedience, he must die. Henry then asked whether his son would reign in France after him. The holy man, after rebuking him for thinking of such matters at such a time, answered that he would not². The origin of the story is probably Vincent Ferrer's visit to Henry at Caen³; but it is eloquent of the deep impression which Henry made on

cf. above, p. 416, n. 2), a description which betrays some bewilderment. The authors of the *Liber Pluscardensis* and of the *Continuatio Scotichron.* (iv. 1217) have a version of the story which is characteristically designed to shed distinction on the Scots. The fuller account (*Plusc. i. 358*) tells how some of Henry's men had ravaged the lands of St Fiacre and plundered the church which contained his relics. Henry, having refused to make restitution, was stricken with St Fiacre's sickness and died at St Maur-des-Fossés, both St Fiacre and St Maur being sons of Scottish kings. After he fell sick Henry asked what was the matter, and the physicians replied "quod sancti Fiatri morbus erat, ex vindicta proveniens, quae incurabiliter mortem igneam adducit; et quod ipse filius fuit regis Scociae. Et tunc respondit rex, 'Illa est maledicta natio: nam ubicumque locorum perrexero, eos in barbam invenio. Nimirum,' inquit, 'si ipsi atroces et vindicativi sunt in vita eorum, qui tam crudelem vindictam post mortem operantur.'" There is far more "nationalism" apparent in the Scottish chronicles of the time than in those of England or France.

St Fiacre, though perhaps a Scot, was probably never in Scotland, but went to the continent from Ireland. For an account of him, see *Cath. Encycl. s.v.*

¹ Said to have been Jean de Gand, who afterwards settled at Troyes, where he died in 1439 (*Boutiot, ii. 446*; cf. *Camusat, Promptuarium, 325 sqq.*).

² *Chast. i. 337 sqq.*

³ Above, pp. 75 sq.

the French that they should have so freely invoked the supernatural to explain his unexpected end.

A funeral had the same fascination for the men of the Middle Ages as it has for most people nowadays; and it is annoying to find detailed histories of Henry's corpse by writers who give but the baldest account of the great events of his life. The body, it seems, was dismembered, and the flesh separated from the bones by boiling. The flesh and bones were then placed in a leaden casket with a great quantity of spices¹; what remained was buried in the churchyard of St Maur-des-Fossés².

Meanwhile the duke of Burgundy had arrived at Bois de Vincennes. After conferring with Bedford, he went to Paris, and took up his quarters in the Hôtel d'Artois³. Incredible as it may seem, he apparently took no part in the obsequies which were being arranged⁴. From his whole attitude at this time, one cannot but conclude that Henry had deeply offended him. He still needed the English alliance, and as long as Henry was able to direct affairs he had to preserve an appearance of friendliness. But as soon as he dared he showed his real feelings. His behaviour was scarcely decent, and must have aroused bitter resentment among the English⁵.

No less remarkable is the fact that Henry's body was never taken into Paris⁶. On Sept. 14⁷ it was carried with great pomp to St Denis, escorted by Bedford and other English lords, and

¹ I have followed the account of the Monk of St Denis (vi. 482), who was in a good position to know the facts. He is copied by Jean Juvénal (567), whose testimony at least shows that he knew of nothing to the contrary. J. Chartier's Latin Chronicle (Bull. Soc. de l'Hist. de France, 1858, p. 217) also mentions the boiling, though it says that the flesh was buried. The author of the Vita (336) declares, on the other hand, that the body was so emaciated that it was possible to embalm it entire: but his testimony on this point is not so weighty as that of the St Denis writer.

² Monstr. iv. 112; Le Fèvre, ii. 64; St Denys, vi. 482.

³ Monstr. iv. 112.

⁴ Only Vita (337) mentions Burgundy as present when the body was removed from Bois de Vincennes. The Monk of St Denis (vi. 482) and Monstrelet (iv. 112) say that it was escorted by Bedford and other English lords. They could hardly have failed to notice Burgundy had he taken part in the proceedings.

⁵ Does this help to account for Gloucester's reckless conduct in relation to Jacqueline of Hainault?

⁶ Monstrelet (iv. 112) significantly takes it for granted that the body was brought to Notre Dame; but he was undoubtedly mistaken. The register of the chapter of Notre Dame contains no allusion to Henry's death, even when recording Bedford's gift to the church on Sept. 10 of a fine piece of goldsmith's work, with enamel images representing the Trinity, St Denis, St George, Henry, and Catherine (Grassoreille, 150 and n. 1, 151, n. 1).

⁷ Bourgeois, 176. For once Fauquembergue's date, Sept. 15, seems to be wrong (ii. 57). He was doubtless misled by the fact that the body reached St Denis late in the day.

was ceremoniously received by the abbot and convent. It remained for the night in the choir of the church, while monks prayed around it, and next day the bishop of Paris, with permission of the abbot, celebrated the principal requiem Mass. Henry's executors gave very handsome gifts to the church and convent; and in the afternoon the procession left on its way to Normandy¹.

The coffin was placed on a cart drawn by four great horses. Above the coffin was a bed, on which lay an effigy of more than life-size, made of boiled leather; it was clad in regal robes, with a crown on its head, a sceptre in its right hand, and a golden apple in its left. As the body passed through towns, a rich silken cloth was held above it, reminding observers of the cloth borne above the Sacrament on Corpus Christi Day. On Sept. 19 Rouen was approached. Two hundred and twenty burgesses in black, carrying torches, joined the procession and escorted it to the cathedral, amid the tolling of all the bells of the city. Next day, after the appropriate services, the coffin, with the superincumbent effigy, was placed on a litter and borne by noblemen to the castle. There it remained till Oct. 5².

Meanwhile, on Sept. 24, Queen Catherine, with a great train of baggage-waggons, came to Rouen³; and Bedford, having reached an understanding with Duke Philip, arrived to do what was necessary for the government of Normandy⁴. It had been resolved to ship the body from Calais, and Catherine accompanied the procession when, on Oct. 5, the journey was resumed⁵. The route lay through Abbeville, Hesdin, Montreuil, and Boulogne, and progress was very slow. The bier was escorted by clergy, who chanted without ceasing the office for the dead as it moved on, and celebrated Masses every day from dawn to noon in the church where the body had lain the

¹ St Denys, vi. 482 sq.; Juv. 568; J. Chartier, in Bull. Soc. de l'Hist. de France, 1858, pp. 217 sq.; Bourgeois, 176; Fauquembergue, ii. 57. Henry came near working a miracle on the way from Bois de Vincennes, for it was deemed very marvellous that two lamps attached to the bier burned throughout the journey to St Denis (St Denys, vi. 482; J. Chartier, in op. cit. p. 217). After recounting the prolonged obsequies of Henry, Monstrelet (iv. 116) comments that as much honour was shown by the English to the dead king as if he were a saint in Paradise; and if the marvel of the lamps had been repeated or paralleled, he might have anticipated his son and become one.

² Cochon, 289; Monstr. iv. 112; Vita, 337; Brut, ii. 430.

³ Cochon, 289; Monstr. iv. 113. It is impossible to credit Monstrelet's statement that up to this time she was ignorant of Henry's death.

⁴ Monstr. iv. 113; Vita, 337.

⁵ Cochon, 289; Monstr. iv. 114; Wals. ii. 345; Brut, ii. 430.

previous night. The funeral car was surrounded by men in white bearing torches; behind, in black, came the members of Henry's household, followed by English nobles. Next came the queen, with a train half a league long. Bedford and his counsellors, with a zeal for propaganda worthy of Henry himself, were resolved that the people of Normandy, Picardy, and Artois should remember him as a being hardly less mighty and magnificent in death than in life, entitled to almost divine honours¹.

Meanwhile shipping had been collected at Calais², and at the beginning of November, after a delay caused by unfavourable winds, the passage to Dover was safely accomplished³. Great preparations had been made for an imposing journey through Kent. The archbishop of Canterbury, several bishops, and many lords awaited the body at Dover⁴. Hearses had been erected at Dover, Canterbury, Ospringe, Rochester, and Dartford⁵. A requiem mass was celebrated at Dover by the bishop of Durham, at Canterbury by the primate, and at other places by other bishops⁶. On Nov. 5, when the procession neared London, the mayor, aldermen, and the craft-gilds went out to Blackheath, as they had done after Agincourt and when Henry brought home his bride, but dressed this time in black. A great body of clergy were waiting at St Thomas' Watering, and all together followed the body to St Paul's along Lombard street, the funeral car, with the great effigy, being arranged and arrayed as it had been during the journey through France. At the cathedral a dirge was sung, and next morning a requiem Mass. In the afternoon of Nov. 6 there was a great funeral procession to Westminster, in which a multitude of the citizens of London took part; and from the church of St Magnus to Temple Bar there was a torch-bearer before every house. In the Abbey church, after the usual requiem, Henry was next day buried, with more ceremony than had been seen at a royal funeral in England for 200 years. He was laid in a very honourable place, between the shrine of Edward the

¹ Monstr. iv. 114; Le Fèvre, ii. 65 sq. To judge from the detailed account of the journey given by the Burgundian chroniclers, Bedford produced the impression he desired.

² Rym. x. 253, 255; Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 5; Iss. Roll 10 Hen. V, Pasch., Sept. 26, 1 Hen. VI, Mich., Oct. 15, 1422; For. Accts. 69, F v^o.

³ For. Accts. 69, F v^o; Vita, 337; Brut, ii. 430; Monstr. iv. 114.

⁴ Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 5.

⁵ Rym. x. 256.

⁶ Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 5.

Confessor and the chapel of the Virgin¹. His tomb was fittingly made of Caen stone and Purbeck marble². Later, at the expense of Queen Catherine, an effigy of the king was placed upon it, the head being of solid silver, the body of oak covered with plates of silver gilt³. Before many years had passed a great chantry-chapel rose above the tomb⁴, and it remains one of the most notable monuments of the Abbey.

“And in that same yere deiden the moste partye of alle the lory treis thourgh all Engelond⁵.”

Henry's English subjects had more warrant for their unrestrained lamentations than most of them imagined. With him the glory of mediaeval England departed; indeed, he had himself done much to destroy it. That, however, was not understood until long afterwards, and for the troubles that followed scarcely anyone of those days held him in the least degree responsible. Had he lived, Englishmen believed, all would have gone well. To them he was a “noble prince and victorouse kyng, flour in his tym of Cristen chiuallrie⁶,” and the writers of that century and the next expanded the theme with wearisome verbosity until his fame culminated in the days of Elizabeth⁷. Of the real Henry little can be learned from the conventional eulogies of his fellow-countrymen; far more

¹ Wals. ii. 345sq.; Brut, ii. 430, 448, 493; Chron. Lond. 110, 111; Kingsford, Chron. 75, 128; Monstr. iv. 114 sq.; Le Fèvre, ii. 67. According to the records of the Brewers' Company, four war-horses, with harness and trappings complete, were offered at the high altar (Herbert, Twelve Livery Companies, i. 99).

² Rym. x. 256; Hist. Monuments Commission, London, i. 71, 73.

³ Brut, ii. 494. The head and gilt plates were carried off by thieves in 1546 (Acts of Privy Council, i. 328). The hands also are missing (Hist. Monuments Comm., London, i. 73).

⁴ This seems to have been erected by Henry's instructions, which stipulated that three masses should be sung there daily (Brut, ii. 495. Cf. Hist. Monuments Comm., London, i. 71 sq.). It was not yet completed in 1441 (ibid. 71). The inscription on the cornice of the tomb-platform runs: “Henricus Quintus Gallorum Mastix jacet hic Henricus in urna 1422 domat omnia virtus pulchra virumque suum sociat tandem Catharina 1437 ocium fuge.” It dates from the sixteenth century (ibid.).

⁵ Brut, ii. 430.

⁶ Ibid. 493. Cf. Gregory, 148.

⁷ For conventional panegyrics, see Wals. ii. 344; Vita, 335. Strecche, breaking into execrable verse at the end of his chronicle (ff. 279 a sq.), declares Henry to have been a Julius in intellect, a Hector in valour, an Achilles in strength, an Augustus in morals, a Paris in eloquence, a Solomon in dialectic, and a Troilus in love. The author of the “First Life” (4) commends to Henry VIII “the virtuous manners, the victorious conquests and the excellent sages and wisdomes of the most renowned Prince in his daies, Kinge Henrie the Fifte. . . (of whose superior in al noblenes, manhoode, and vertue, to my pretence, it is not read nor heard amongst the princes of England since William of Normandie obtayned the government of this realme).”

valuable are the judgments passed upon him by open enemies or reluctant allies in France.

One would have expected all French writers of the fifteenth century to be critical towards Henry, and some of them to be venomous. But on reaching his death, whatever hard things they may previously have said about him and the English, they either content themselves with a bald notice of the event or give a survey of his personality and character in which the good is far more prominent than the bad. Nothing in Henry impressed the French so forcibly as his zeal for justice. For this, says the Burgundian Fenin, the poor loved him above all others, since he was resolved to save them from the oppressions of the well-born; and thus he had the prayers of the clergy and the humble¹. The Cordeliers chronicle, also written soon after Henry's death, likewise selects this love of justice for special praise²; but far more convincing than eulogies penned while the English were still a power in northern France is the testimony of Chastellain, a bitter critic of the English, who wrote after their expulsion from all Henry's conquests. "Above all," he says, Henry was "the prince of justice, both in relation to himself, for the sake of example, and in relation to others, according to equity and right; he gave support to none out of favour, nor did he suffer wrong to go unpunished out of regard for kinship³." And it is still more astonishing that dauphinists tell the same tale. To Percival de Cagny Henry was "tres fort justicier⁴." That his fair dealing between great and small should win the commendation of the Monk of St Denis⁵ is not so remarkable, for that chronicler never commits himself wholeheartedly to either side; but neither caution nor prejudice can have prompted Jean Juvéna! to borrow the Monk's praises, still less to heighten them in the process of translation⁶. Henry

¹ Fenin, 186.

² Cordeliers, 322.

³ Chast. i. 334: "Et tout premier il estoit prince de justice tant envers soy meme, par exemple, comme envers aultruy par equité droiturière; ne supportoit personne par faveur, ne torfais ne laissoit impugnis par affinité de sang."

⁴ Cagny, 126.

⁵ St Denys, vi. 126. The tone of the *Chronique du Religieux* would be more surprising if the last chapters of the work were written, as M. Samaran contends, by Jean Chartier (Bibl. Éc. Chartes, lxxxvii. 150 sqq.). It may be pointed out, however, that the estimate of Henry in the Latin chronicle which Chartier unquestionably wrote is much less favourable than that in the *Chronique du Religieux* (Soc. de l'Hist. de France, Bulletin, 1858, p. 217, *Annuaire-Bulletin*, 1926, pp. 184 sqq.).

⁶ "Ledit Roy. . .avoit este. . .grand justicier, qui sans acception des personnes faisoit aussi bonne justice au petit que au grand" (Juv. 567).

was doubtless often harsh to the point of cruelty¹; but men expected nothing else in the wars of that time, and much could be forgiven to one whose justice, however rough, was yet administered truly and indifferently.

The French found other reasons for admiring Henry. That he was an honourable fighter neither party disputed². His claim to the French throne, preposterous though it seems to us, was denied with little recrimination³; and even Chastellain was content to refer it to the judgment of God⁴. He was remembered as a brave, loyal, and upright man, temperate in speech, unflinching in adversity, with his trust in God rather than in fortune. On French opinion he left the impress of a commanding personality, a mind habitually touched to great issues, a character in which the mean and the paltry had singularly little place⁵. To his ability all paid tribute. French writers naturally and justly make much of the advantage which he derived from French dissensions; but they recognise frankly that by his military skill, his far-seeing prudence, his unresting energy, and his inexorable resolution, he was able to wrest from his opportunities a success which no other living man could have compassed⁶.

Whether Henry's French contemporaries estimated him aright may be left to the judgment of those who have read the foregoing narrative. In my opinion they showed singular fairness and acumen. It is not, however, for that reason alone that I dispense with that neat portrait of the hero with which a biography is traditionally supposed to end: I am also influenced by the consciousness that my sketch would not have pleased Dr Wylie, who, as I think the preceding pages have betrayed, liked Henry less than I do. Yet on certain points, I am sure, we should agree. Hard, domineering, over-ambitious, bigoted,

¹ This is emphasised by several contemporaries, e.g. Monstr. iv. 116; Le Fèvre, ii. 68; J. Chartier, in Bull. Soc. de l'Hist. de France, 1858, p. 217. Many instances of Henry's harshness have been given above.

² "Et bien entretenoit la discipline de chevalerie comme jadis faisoient les Rommains" (Le Fèvre, ii. 68). Cagny (126) calls him "moult chevalereux."

³ See e.g. the allusion to it in St Denys, vi. 480.

⁴ Chast. ii. 157.

⁵ "Il estoit sobre de bouche, veritable en parolle, hault et eleve en couraige, et a viles choses et basses se declinoit envis. . . craignoit plus Dieu qu'il ne se fiast en fortune, et des vertueux et constans en cuer avoit la sorte" (Chast. i. 334). "Magnanimus, valens in armis, prudens, sagax. . . a populo famabatur" (St Denys, vi. 480, followed by Juv. 567). Cf. Cordeliers, 322; Fenin, 186.

⁶ Chast. i. 334; Monstr. iv. 116; Le Fèvre, ii. 68; Cordeliers, 322; Cagny, 126; St Denys, vi. 480; Juv. 567.

sanctimonious, priggish Henry may have been. His will was doubtless set on purposes unworthy of a great or good man. Though he was fond of music¹, tried to achieve the completion of the most famous church in England², prized a good book³, and by example and precept promoted the use of the English tongue in diplomacy⁴, business⁵, and literary composition⁶, he cannot, as a patron of art or letters, approach his brother Humphrey, or even equal his uncle Bishop Beaufort. Nevertheless, take him for all in all, he was indisputably the greatest Englishman of his day; and placed beside the flashy Sigismund, the afflicted Charles VI, the sluggish dauphin, the treacherous John the Fearless, the unstable Duke Philip, he towers above them all—more forceful in arms, more discreet in council, more steadfast in purpose, and, with all his imperfections, more honourable in life.

¹ Cf. above, p. 212. For minstrels with Henry in France in 1421–22, see Exch. Accts. 50/13; For. Accts. 69, H v^o. In September, 1421, he paid £2. 13s. 8d. for a harp, which had been bought in London and sent to him in France (Devon, 367).

² See above, i. 205 sqq.

³ First Life, 92. In November, 1421, he paid £12. 8s. 0d. for twelve books on hunting (Devon, 368). Like all book-lovers, Henry sometimes omitted to return books he had borrowed (Rym. x. 317).

⁴ Rym. ix. 427 sqq.; cf. above, p. 157.

⁵ Herbert, Twelve Livery Companies, i. 106.

⁶ Lydgate, Troy Book, Prologue, ll. 69 sqq.; Hoccleve, Mi. Po. i. 130; cf. his Regement of Princes, *passim*.

APPENDIX A

(Vol. i. p. 1)

HENRY IV

On the date of Henry IV's death, in addition to the authorities cited in Wylie, iv. 105, see Elmham, Lib. Metr. 95; Brut, ii. 593; Bodl. MS. 496, f. 2246. Many modern writers give the wrong date, some being wildly inaccurate.

With regard to the cause of death, the recently-discovered portion of Adam of Usk's chronicle (119) states that he had suffered for five years from rotting of the flesh, parching of the eyes, and protrusion of the bowel. It further asserts that he died in the abbot's room at Westminster, thereby bearing out his horoscope which indicated that he should die in the Holy Land. His dreadful end, according to the same authority, was foretold at his coronation, when his head was infested with lice after the anointing and one of the gold nobles which he had ready for the offertory slipped from his hand and rolled away, Adam himself having picked it up and returned it. One of the facts about Henry IV which remained in popular memory was that "he travaylede with grete sekenys" (Greg., Chron. 53). Hardyng (374) refers to "his face so foule that leprous doth appear." His death is ascribed to leprosy in Kingsford, Lit. 277 (Southern Chronicle), and 282 (Northern Chronicle), and in Cartellieri, Beiträge, iv. 7, where there is a statement, dating from a year or two after his death, that the same disease had afflicted his mother and her father.

Strecche (264 b) says that Henry IV appeared at the parliament of 1413 declaring that he would recover the Holy Cross for Christendom if God should give him life and strength, and that he got a grant of money for the crusade.

For Edmund Labourde, an illegitimate son of Henry IV, born in 1401, see Cal. Pap. Lett. vi. 314. No other trace of him has yet been found, and it is therefore probable that he died young. Cf. Eng. Hist. Rev. xix. 96.

APPENDIX B

(Vol. i. p. 1)

THE BIRTH-YEAR OF HENRY V

In Wylie, iii. 323, 324, reasons are given for believing that Henry V was born in August, 1386. Many modern writers have accepted this year. Others, however, have favoured 1387 or 1388. The correct date appears to be Sept. 16, 1387, which is given in the calendar of Elmham's *Annales Britannorum, Saxonum, et Anglorum* (Cotton MS., Claudius, E. iv. f. 32 b; cf. Kingsford, Biogr. 62).

A cradle in which Henry is said to have been rocked was sold to "an unknown purchaser" at Christie's on Feb. 21, 1908.

APPENDIX C

(Vol. i. p. 1)

JAMES I OF SCOTLAND

[Under this heading Dr Wylie left a few notes, consisting mainly of references to modern writers who have treated of various aspects of James's reign, with occasional quotations of their views. There is apparently no addition to our knowledge of James, and as it is impossible to tell what Dr Wylie meant to include in this Appendix, there seemed no purpose in an attempt to put the notes into literary form.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX D

(Vol. i. p. 16)

SIR JOHN FALSTAFF

For John Fastolf, kt., of Cowhawe in the parish of Nacton, near Ipswich, against whom Sir John Oldcastle brought an action for a debt of 800 marks in 1403, see Harcourt, *The two Sir John Fastolfs*, 58–60, where it is argued that he and not John Fastolf of Caister is the original of Shakespeare's Falstaff. For John Falstoffe of Maldon, Essex, see Maldon rolls 13/2, May 26, 1421. Extracts from the will of Hugh Fastolf, citizen of London, dated May 11, 1392, are given in *Hist. MSS. Comm. Rept. iv.* 461. This may be the same man as Hugh Fastolf, sheriff of Norfolk (*List of Sheriffs*, 87). A "Mons. Hugh Fastolf" was in the retinue of John Blount in 1417 (*Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 24,704*, f. 32), and "Sir Hewe Fastolf that deyde at Cane" is mentioned in the will of John Fastolf of Caister (*Paston Lett. i.* 456). Fastolf Alley, in the parish of St Stephen, Coleman Street, London, is referred to in the will of Joan Fastolf, Sept. 13, 1417 (*Sharpe, Wills, ii.* 419).

[Dr Wylie added a number of modern opinions as to the credibility of the tales of Henry's wild youth. These had been collected before the discovery by Mr Kingsford of "*The First English Life of Henry V.*," a knowledge of which is shown only in a note inserted after the greater part of the Appendix was written. The whole question has of course been put on a new footing by Mr Kingsford's edition of this work.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX E

(Vol. i. p. 22)

THOMAS CHAUCER

For Thomas Chaucer as Chief Butler in the time of Henry IV, see Wylie, ii. 476, iii. 116. To this office was attached that of Coroner of the City of London (Lett. Bk. I. 5, 21, 115; Simon, i. 297). In the Subsidy roll of 1412 Thomas Chaucer owns property in London yielding £8 per annum (Archaeol. Journ. xlv. 61). For his re-appointment as Chief Butler on March 22, 1413, see Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 159. Particulars of the duty on wines appear in his account for 1-6 Hen. V in Exch. Accts. 81/8.

On March 21, 1413, he was appointed a Justice of the Peace for Oxfordshire (Cal. Pat. 1413-1416, p. 422), and on Jan. 11, 1414, he was on a commission for trying Lollards in the same county (ibid. p. 178). For the confirmation to him of Queen Joan's grants of Woodstock, Hanborough, and Stonesfield, see ibid. p. 7. On Sept. 23, 1413, he was granted the custody of the forest of Woolmer and Alice Holt (ibid. p. 102), and on Feb. 13, 1414, he was confirmed in the enjoyment of twenty marks a year from the farm of Wallingford, which he had received from Richard II (ibid. p. 157; cf. Wylie, iii. 117, iv. 235). On Nov. 6, 1413, he was sheriff of Hants. (List of Sheriffs, 55; Woodward, iii. 101).

Chaucer was appointed a commissioner of array for Oxfordshire on May 29, 1415 (Rym. ix. 257). For £50 received from him and John Beck for the custody of the manor of Rycote, near Thame, see Receipt Roll, 3 Hen. V, Pasch., June 5, 1415. [In 1417 he went in the expedition to Normandy with nine men-at-arms and thirty archers (HU 90. 1215, App. VII), and he remained on active service in France throughout 1418 (D.K.R. xli. 713, 717-19).] By May 1, 1419, he had ceased to be Chief Butler, and on June 19 of that year the office was held by Nicholas Merbury (Iss. Roll 7 Hen. V, Pasch., May 1 and June 19, 1419). In 1420 he had to do with loans from five hundreds in Oxfordshire (ibid. 7 Hen. V, Mich., Feb. 3 and 15, 1420). On June 26, 1420, he was abroad (Rot. Franc. 8 Hen. V, m. 4).

The inscription on the seal with the pelican referred to in Wylie, iv. 312, is certainly "S. Ghofrai Chaucier" (see Aubrey, i. 760; Kirk, pp. lii, 323). Lounsbury (i. 106) is wrong in supposing that the letter "G" has disappeared.

The Sacrist roll of Westminster Abbey shows that Thomas Chaucer was the owner of the house in the garden of St Mary's chapel which Geoffrey had rented just before his death (Athenaeum, Jan. 27, 1900). Several scholars have taken this as conclusive evidence that Thomas was Geoffrey's son, but Garnett (i. 140) will only admit that it raises a strong presumption in favour of close kinship between the two. It has also been suggested (Kirk, pp. li, lii) that Thomas was the adopted son of Geoffrey.

Thomas became a member of the Council on Jan. '25, 1424 (Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 155, 157). In 1431, Philippa, duchess of York, left one hundred marks to Thomas Chaweser, or Chauser (Wills of Kings, 228). He died in 1434. For his estate and that of his wife Maud, including Ewelme with a manor called Burgess, see Cal. Inq. post Mort. iv. 160, 177. In the statutes of the almshouse at Ewelme founded in 1437 by his daughter Alice, the inmates are to gather daily round the tomb of "oure fadyr and mother Thomas Chawcer and Mawte his wife" (Whethamstede, ii. 552).

[For APPENDICES F (i. 42: on the Duchy of Cornwall); G (i. 71: on St Patrick's Purgatory); H (i. 71: on Queen Isabel) I have not found any material among Dr Wylie's papers.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX H

(Vol. i. p. 95)

EXPENSES OF ARAGONESE ENVOYS

[It is evident from an examination of Dr Wylie's papers that the reference to a second "Appendix H" was made by mistake.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX I

(Vol. i. p. 95)

COST OF LIVING

The following prices are taken from the accounts of daily expenses at Dunster Castle in the year ending June 27, 1406 (Maxwell-Lyte, Dunster, 114-19): chickens (pulli), $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ each, or fourteen for $16d.$; mallards, $2d.$ each; geese, $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ each; woodcock, $1d.$; curlew, $3d.$; teal, $1d.$; congers, $4d.$; malwel, $3d.$ to $6d.$; turbot, $5d.$; eels, $6d.$; ray, $3d.$; salmon, $7d.$; hake, $2\frac{1}{2}d.$ to $5d.$; oysters, $3d.$ a tun; sea-dog, $1d.$; gurnet, $2d.$; ling, 6 for $15d.$; red herrings, $6s. 8d.$ the cask.

Milk cost $1d.$ a gallon; salt, $2s. 4d.$ a bushel; dates, $3d.$ a pound. Wheat was $6s. 8d.$ a quarter; oats, $16d.$ a bushel. Three pottles of mustard could be bought for $7\frac{1}{2}d.$, and a pottle of honey for $8d.$ Eight oxen and calves were bought for $46s. 8d.$

In the Maldon rolls there are the following figures: red herring (1403), $4s. 6d.$ a cask (1/6); oats (1421), $2s. 8d.$ a bushel (13/4); a goose (1409), $5d.$ (5/2); two ewes (1420), $40d.$ (12/4).

APPENDIX J

(Vol. i. p. 164)

THE THREE ESTATES

[Dr Wylie's notes under this heading consist mainly of references to modern works. They are manifestly incomplete and it is impossible to tell what purpose this appendix was intended to serve.—w. t. w.]

For APPENDIX K (vol. i. p. 172: on Simon Caboche) and APPENDIX L (vol. i. p. 173: on Ludwig of Ingolstadt) Dr Wylie's papers contain no material.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX M

(Vol. i. p. 176)

JEAN PETIT

Jean Petit was probably born at Bacqueville, near Dieppe, where he was intimately associated with Guillaume Martel VII, lord of Bacqueville (Hellot, Nobles, 5, 13, 36-42, 64). The date of his birth is uncertain, but must have been about the middle of the fourteenth century (Aubert, Compétence, 245; Vapereau, 1576; Munier-Jolain, 270). His poems (published by Le Verdier for the Société rouennaise de Bibliophiles, extracts being given in Hellot, Nobles, and Sauvage, Plan d'Éducation) prove him to have been not only a learned and outspoken man, a good hater when his feelings were aroused, but a devout and high-minded patriot (Sauvage, passim), at least in the first portion of his life. His power of hating is shown by his polemic against Jean de Monzon, the Spanish Dominican, who in 1387 had opposed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, then held by the dominant faction in the University of Paris (Boulliot, i. 242; Feret, iv. 136). His heated language in this controversy has lent colour to the widely-accepted view that he was a Franciscan friar; but he seems never to have been called friar by any of his contemporaries, and the evidence supports the opinion that he belonged to no religious order. Under date of 1408, when he was *maître des Requêtes* to the duke of Burgundy, La Barre (ii. 102, 113, 156) calls him *Maistre Jean Petit, Cordelier*; and an extract from an account of Jean de Prassy, belonging to 1408, is quoted in Itin. 693, where he appears as "*Maistre Jehan Petit, Cordelier.*" The passage is taken from a volume of extracts made in the eighteenth century, now in the Bibl. Nat., Collection de Bourgogne, tome lxxv, f. 80. M. Henri Omont very kindly supplied the information that the word "*Cordelier*" does not appear in the original, which runs "*M^{re} Jean Petit, docteur en theologie, conseiller ordinaire aux gages de cl. livres par lettres du 20 fevrier 1405.*"

For a summary of Petit's famous treatise in defence of tyrannicide, see Vallet de Viriville, *Assass.* 274-81; Collas, 389-96. A version of the text is given by Monstrelet, i. 178 sqq. For a criticism of this, an account of a better text, and a survey of the whole subject, see Coville in *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, lxxii. 57 sqq.

Petit died at Vieil Hesdin on July 15, 1411 (*Du Pin*, iii. 59; *Valois*, iv. 315).

[For APPENDIX N (i. 192: on Pier Candido Decembri) there is nothing in Dr Wylie's papers. See his article in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xxiv. 84 sqq., into which most of his material for this appendix seems to have been diverted.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX O

(Vol. i. p. 196)

JOHN SOMERSET

The name is given as "Sumerseth" in *Cal. Pat.* 1436-1441, p. 426; "Somerseth" in *Cotton MS.*, Julius, E. iv; *Harl. MS.* 864, f. 182; and many other authorities; the form "Somerset" occurring in *Wills of Kings*, 292; *Rot. Parl.* v. 70, 72, 216. The word is played upon in *Vita*, 339, where Somerset is "doctor gloriosus qui *aestatis sedis* gloriosum cognomen sortitus est," cf. "fertilis aestatis florida sedes," *ibid.* 341.

In 1437 Somerset received a grant of the manor of Ruislip in Middlesex (*Cal. Pat.* 1436-1441, pp. 46, 286). This he vacated on May 13, 1444, when it was bestowed on King's College, Cambridge (*Rot. Parl.* v. 87). It is to his connection with Ruislip that we owe most of our knowledge of the details of his life (see *Elmham*, *Mon. Aug.* xxii; *Dict. Nat. Biog.* liii. 245; *Kingsford*, *Biogr.* 68). For he had a grievance about this property against the Fellows of King's, and in his old age he set it forth in Latin elegiacs (*Cotton MS.*, Julius, F. vii. 4. In *Cotton Cat.* p. 23, it is headed "Querimonia Johannis Somerset Physici Henrici VI" and is subscribed at the foot, "scripta in Univ. Camb. per M. Wyrcester, May 19, 1471"). It is printed in *Vita* (347 sqq.). From it we learn that he was a Londoner by birth (*ibid.* 354), that when quite young he had been a student at Oxford (*ibid.* 350; cf. *Tanner*, 682; *Wylie*, iii. 417; *Brodrick*, *Univ.* 63), whence he passed to Pembroke College, Cambridge, of which University he was twice proctor (*Vita*, 354). In 1418 he became master of the grammar school at Bury St Edmund's (*Tanner*, 682). This appointment he owed to his patron Thomas Beaufort, duke of Exeter (*Vita*, 348. He was one of the witnesses to the duke's will, dated Dec. 29, 1426—*Wills of Kings*, 246). On Sept. 27, 1423, he was appointed the first supervisor of physic when an attempt was made to systematise the practice of surgery and medicine in London (*Power*, 7), and he claims that he had a high reputation among the doctors in London, Paris, and Rouen (*Vita*, 348. His name, however, does not appear among

the members of the English nation at the University of Paris, and it is unlikely that he actually studied there). On Feb. 27, 1428, he appears as a doctor of medicine receiving £40 a year and his livery as a servant of King Henry VI (Cal. Pat. 1422-1429, p. 460; cf. Ord. Priv. Co. iii. 287). On Christmas Eve, 1430, he was with the court at Rouen, where he appended his signature "I. S." as witness of the presentation of the famous missal to the king by the duchess of Bedford, describing himself as "domini regis ad personam servitor et sanitatem viteque conservationem consulens" (Gough, Missal, 19; Dibdin, Decameron, i. p. cxxxvii). On Oct. 20, 1432, he was in receipt of £60 a year for his services about the king's person, both in teaching him and in preserving his health (Cal. Pat. 1429-1436, p. 241; cf. Ord. Priv. Co. iv. 30, 131). He nevertheless stated in his old age that he had been living for the last twenty-five years in the king's household without receiving any pay (Vita, 348). On Dec. 18, 1439, he became Chancellor of the Exchequer and Warden of the Tower Mint and of the coinage of gold and silver (Cal. Pat. 1436-1441, p. 418; cf. *ibid.* 510, 521, 551; Vita, 352; Rym. x. 802; Dict. Nat. Biog. xliii. 245), holding these offices till May 29, 1447, but during the whole time he was retained in the service of the king's person (Vita, 339 sqq.; Cal. Pat. 1436-1441, p. 426). He found time, however, to write some medical treatises (Lib. Nig. Scacc. i. p. xxxi), as well as the book entitled "De Facultate Metrica" (Bale, Index, 257). When Henry decided to build his great college at Cambridge, Somerset was one of the commissioners appointed to draw up the statutes (Cal. Pat. 1436-1441, p. 521), he helped to choose its site, and became one of the trustees of its endowments (Rot. Parl. v. 48, 70; Vita, 359; Wills of Kings, 348). He was an executor of the will of Humphrey, duke of Gloucester, and one of the commissioners appointed to enquire into his possessions (Rot. Parl. v. 339; Cal. Pat. 1446-1452, p. 45; Rym. xi. 160; Vickers, 442. For his communications with the University of Oxford as to Duke Humphrey's books, see Tanner, 682; Kingsford, Lit. 58). In 1451, parliament petitioned for his dismissal as a partisan of the duke of Suffolk (Rot. Parl. v. 216). The result does not seem to be known.

Somerset was a married man (Bekynton, ii. 244). His interests were largely bound up with the county of Middlesex, of which he was a justice of the peace in 1437, 1439, and 1446 (Cal. Pat. 1436-1441, p. 586, 1441-1446, p. 474). In his old age he bought a house at Osterley, near Brentford, where the naked and the hungry were always at his door (Vita, 340); and here he died before 1455 (Rot. Parl. 339; Cal. Inq. post Mort. iv. 321; Lysons, ii. 24).

[FOR APPENDIX P (i. 199: on the hermit of Westminster) and APPENDIX Q (i. 205: on the clerk of the Hanaper), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material.—w. r. w.]

APPENDIX R

(Vol. i. pp. 205, 360)

RICHARD WHITINGTON

In Richard's epitaph in the church of St Michael Paternoster he is called "Albificans villam" (Stow, iii. 5), which seems to indicate that his name was spelt Whittington and that the first "i" was pronounced long. The spelling Whittington appears in the Subsidy roll of 1412 (Archaeol. Journ. xliv. 62). In Lib. Alb. i. 4, his intimate friend John Carpenter spells the name Whityngton. It is "Whytyngtone" in Lett. Bk. I. pp. 52, 53, et passim.

[The rest of Dr Wylie's notes on Whittington consist of references to well-known modern works.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX S

(Vol. i. p. 208)

RICHARD II

[Dr Wylie's papers contain some very rough notes on Richard II's character, his badge, his seal, portraits of him, and one or two other matters relating to him. The notes consist largely of references to well-known and readily accessible works. I cannot tell what use Dr Wylie intended to make of them.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX T

(Vol. i. p. 214)

ARCHBISHOP SCROPE'S RISING

The account of Archbishop Scrope's conspiracy given in Raine, *Historians*, iii. 288 [the volume being published after the appearance of vol. ii. of Dr Wylie's work on Henry IV], was evidently written some considerable time after the death, in 1435, of the duke of Bedford, whom the author attacks as a second Aithophel for deceiving the faithful David. He wrongly gives the name of the archbishop's father as Stephen instead of Henry. He had his information about the capture from John Corbridge, who was present at Shipton Moor and told how the archbishop celebrated Mass in the open air on May 28, 1405, and then addressed his followers. He was not, he said, rising against the king, but merely approaching certain lords in order to obtain a remedy for the oppression of the Church, which was burdened every year with the exaction of a tenth of her belongings. He added that he was going to mediate in the

quarrel between the earl of Westmorland and the Earl Marshal. After the speech Lord (i.e. Sir Henry) Fitzhugh arrived and offered his hand, promising that if the archbishop would come across and treat for peace, he should return to his people safe and sound. The archbishop accordingly advanced with a few followers, his crozier being borne before him. The little band was surrounded; Prince John called the archbishop a traitor, seized him together with the Earl Marshal and Sir William Plumpton, and ordered the rest to be gone, as peace was now made. In the account of what followed, Henry IV is called "the son of John Gaunt, duke of Lancaster in right of his wife." When the mayor and citizens of York prostrated themselves, the archbishop, it is said, was present, and the king said to him, "See, you traitor, how you have brought these men to grief," to which the archbishop made no reply, but commended the people to God. Gascoigne's refusal to pass sentence is recorded in these words: "Sire, you have no law to kill an archbishop, and what you cannot do as a king, I cannot do as a judge." The king flew into a rage and violently upbraided him; but Gascoigne's memory was blest, because he stood firm for God's truth, while Fulthorpe (called "*viro non iudici*"), who passed the final sentence, was afterwards struck with leprosy, the writer having himself seen him in that state at York.

The writer (who calls himself Thomas) may have been Thomas Cumberworth, who died in 1451 (Wylie, ii. 234, n. 2), or Thomas Gascoigne, who died in 1458 (Wylie, ii. 359). It could not have been Thomas Dautry, as suggested by Raine (p. 288), for he died in 1437 (Wylie, ii. 234, n. 2).

For Fulthorpe as "*juris et litterarum peritus*" see Raine, *Historians*, ii. 432. He is called Fulthorpe "*chivaler qui est le south (sic) constable*" in *Year Book*, 13 Hen. IV, Mich., no. 10, quoted in Harcourt, 365, who thinks that "the popular view that Scrope was subjected to a mock trial by a few laymen is a complete travesty of the facts."

Adam of Usk (99, 275), writing c. 1421, refers to him as "*jam sanctus ex multitudine miraculorum approbatus*." John Strecche (265), writing after 1422, though strongly Lancastrian in sentiment and regretting that York is making far too good a thing out of its disloyalty, feels bound to record, for the benefit of posterity, the miracles worked at the archbishop's grave—"in memoriam futurorum non ejus miracula frivole concrepando nec cuiusdam alterius meritis derogando sed plane procedendo prout vulgus communiter logicat." The "*Northern*" *Chronicle* (Kingsford, Lit.), written early in the reign of Henry VI, says, "*infinita miracula. . . quasi cotidie de novo choruscant. Nam simulacra et similitudines miraculorum cum cedulis monstrantibus infirmitates et loca personarum testantur satis clare*" (p. 282). In *Pol. Songs*, ii. 267, the archbishop is "*holy bisshop Scrope the blyssed confessor*." In 1471 Edward IV declared that the archbishop suffered death "*for the right and title of our ancestry*" (Scrope and Grosvenor, ii. 161; Purey-Cust, i. 101).

The execution is now believed to have taken place in "one of the fields opposite to St Clement's Rectory," Keble, 64; or on the spot where

houses nos. 67 and 69, Bishopthorpe Road, now stand—this information being kindly communicated by Dr J. Solloway. Strecche (263) describes the place as being “extra muros civitatis sub quodam molendino ventitico.”

[For APPENDIX U (i. 220: on the Charterhouse of Sheen) and APPENDIX V (i. 221: on the sale of pardons), Dr Wylie left no material that could be used.—w. t. w.]

For APPENDIX W (i. 225: on alien priories), Dr Wylie left a few references, mainly to Monasticon, Rot. Parl. v. 48, and the Patent Rolls. They seem to contain nothing of material value that may not be found in the standard works on English Monasticism or in the Victoria County History.—w. t. w.]

For APPENDIX X (i. 229, 286: on John Wycliffe), Dr Wylie collected some opinions on the Reformer's character. The recent publication of Dr H. B. Workman's “John Wyclif” (2 vols., Oxford, 1926) has robbed them of most of their value and interest.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX Y

(Vol. i. p. 235)

THE KING'S HALL AT CAMBRIDGE

On March 26, 1413, John Stone, king's secretary, was appointed warden of “our college of our students in Cambridge University”—i.e. the King's Hall (Cal. Pat. 1413–1416, p. 11; cf. Wylie, iii. 351, 408). Stone was archdeacon of Northampton and a notable pluralist (Cal. Pat. 1413–1416, pp. 11, 167, 175, 187, 198, 632; Gesta, 117; Le Neve, ii. 427). He was succeeded at King's Hall by Richard Dereham on June 5, 1415 (Memoranda roll, K.R. 3–4 Hen. V (no. 192), m. 7; Cal. Pat. 1413–1416, p. 350). In June, 1416, Dereham was at Constance, where he acted as protonotary in the enquiry as to the Strasbourg dispute (Finke, Elektenprozess, from Hardt, iv. 1384). He was dead by Sept. 25, 1417 (Orig. Lett., Ser. III, i. 74). [For his doings at Constance, see also Finke, Acta, ii. 322, iv. 680.]

On Oct. 3, 1417 (Cal. Pat. 1416–1419) Richard Holme succeeded Richard Dereham (Wylie, iii. 351) as warden of the King's Hall at Cambridge. For his appointment see the letter of Henry V to the chancellor, Bishop Langley, written at Caen on Sept. 25, 1417 (Chancery Warrants, Ser. I, 1364/38; Orig. Lett., Ser. III, i. 74). Richard Holme had formerly been a scholar of the King's Hall, but had ceased to be so in favour of his brother on Aug. 20, 1415 (Exch. Accts. 348/29).

For the accounts of Richard Holme as warden of the King's Hall (Gardein de la Salle) from Oct. 3, 1417, to Oct. 3, 1421, see Exch. Accts. 348/30. The receipts for the four years are given as £435. The number of scholars varied from twenty-three to thirty-two. Each received 2*d.* a day and the warden 4*d.* The expenses include payments for

splinters (i.e. stakes) for the garden, 6*d.* for "sowding" a lead gutter, 2*d.* for two "fothers" of burnt lime, 6*s.* 2*d.* for a rope for the well, 6*s.* 8*d.* for glazing windows, and 62*s.* for 6000 flat slats. A baker received 2*s.* 11*d.* as wages for a week, two labourers 1*s.* 6*d.*; one slater and his "famulus" were paid 2*s.* 11*d.* for five days, and another slater 4*s.* for a week.

Holme, who died in 1424, left many books to the library of Michaelhouse at Cambridge (Willis and Clark, ii. 399). He was succeeded on July 6, 1424, by Robert, third son of Henry Lord Fitzhugh, the king's chamberlain, who became chancellor of the University in the same year and bishop of London in 1431 (Le Neve, iii. 697: for his preferments, see Cal. Pat. 1413-1416, p. 283, 1416-1422, p. 303; Le Neve, i. 611, ii. 57, 96, iii. 189, 191, 599).

[For APPENDIX Z (i. 263: on Fickett's field) and APPENDIX A¹ (i. 278: on John Prophet), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX B¹

(Vol. i. p. 282)

LOLLARDRY

Some modern purists in language insist that the word is Lollardy, not Lollardry. On philological principles the truth would appear to be exactly the reverse; but the examples given in Murray, *s.v.*, prove that in practice both forms have been used indifferently from the beginning. It may be pointed out that in Cotton MS., Cleop. E. ii, both "Lollardia" and "Lollardria" appear in official documents, as they do in the ballad printed in Pol. Songs, ii. 243.

[Dr Wylie had collected a number of references to mediaeval and modern writers to illustrate his point, which, however, will hardly be disputed.—w. t. w.]

[For APPENDIX C¹ (i. 289: on scribes), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material.—w. t. w.]

APPENDICES D¹ (i. 289: on meals), E¹ (i. 299: on Wickham's foundations), F¹ (i. 303: on the pallium), G¹ (i. 306: on St Stephen's chapel), H¹ (i. 323: on Walter Hungerford), I¹ (i. 324: on the duchy of Lancaster).

Dr Wylie's papers contain no material which can be used for these appendices.—w. t. w.]

For APPENDIX J¹ (i. 328: on Richard Holme), see Appendix Y; and for APPENDIX K¹ (i. 337: on alien priories), see Appendix W.

[For APPENDIX L¹ (i. 352: subject uncertain), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material.—w. t. w.]

For APPENDICES M¹ (i. 353, 362: on song-schools), and N¹ (i. 354: subject uncertain), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material that can be used.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX O¹

(Vol. i. p. 356)

THE PROPOSED CONFISCATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY

[Dr Wylie's draft for this appendix was written more than twenty years ago. Since then several writers have dealt with the subject, notably Dr H. B. Workman in Appendix Z of his "John Wyclif."—w. t. w.]

For APPENDICES P¹ (i. 360: on chimneys), Q¹ (i. 373: on Nicholas Flamel), R¹ (i. 374: on beds), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX S¹

(Vol. i. p. 376)

SURGERY

[For this appendix Dr Wylie left some notes, the precise purpose of which is not clear. Some of the references they contain may, however, be of interest.—w. t. w.]

For surgical treatment of wounds, gangrene, cataract, hernia, dropsy, and stone, see Chauliac, lxxi. For the treatment of a tooth that is "akyng or rotyng," see Arderne MS. f. xlix (Emmanuel Coll., Cambridge). There is a picture of a dentist at work in Schultz, 142. Operations on the skull are illustrated in Besant, Survey, i. 337; J. A. Herbert, 200: on the ear, in Schultz, 142: on the leg, in E. H. Langlois, 142. There is a picture of dissecting at an anatomy school in Chauliac, 25. For a bone-setting ointment see Bonis, i. p. cxxii.

There is a reference to "femmes entendues en medicine, mulieres Salernitanae" in Chauliac, lxiii. For "metgesses" at Perpignan, see Vidal, 182. For "barbiers souvent des femmes," see Piton, 161; and for women licensed to perform surgery in the fourteenth century, see South, p. x.

[For APPENDICES T¹ (i. 382: on lazar-houses) and U¹ (i. 388: on masers), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material that could be used.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX V¹

(Vol. i. p. 392)

EDWARD HALLE

[Dr Wylie's papers do not reveal what he intended to say about Halle; but it may be pointed out that recent researches have shed much light on the trustworthiness of Halle's Chronicle: see *Bibl. Éc. des Chartes*, lxxxv. 123 sqq.; *E.H.R.* xli. 504 sqq.—w. t. w.]

APPENDICES W¹ (i. 393: on the Oriflamme), X¹ (i. 397: on tolls at Bapaume), Y¹ (i. 407: on King John's ransom), Z¹ (i. 408: on Charles V of France), A² (i. 409: on the death of King John of France), B² (i. 413: on the duke of Burgundy's daughters), C² (i. 427: on tennis-balls), D² (i. 448: on finance in 1415), E² (i. 451: on the capture of Ceuta), F² (i. 455: on paper and parchment), G² (i. 456: on the defence of the march of Calais), H² (i. 456: on maritime defence), I² (i. 457: on soldiers' pay), J² (i. 459: on compulsory armour).

For none of these appendices do Dr Wylie's papers yield any material. In one or two instances, indeed, there is reason to suspect that what he at one time meant to use for an appendix subsequently found its way into the text.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX K²

(Vol. i. p. 461)

PLATE ARMOUR ON MONUMENTS

[It seems to have been Dr Wylie's intention to compile a list of monuments dating from the early fifteenth century which represent knights or men-at-arms clad entirely in plate armour. His knowledge of such monuments, however, seems to have been derived almost entirely from fairly well-known books, and the fragmentary list which he had made does not, so far as I can judge, lead to any new conclusions. Much work on the subject has been done since Dr Wylie's notes were made.—w. t. w.]

For APPENDICES L² (i. 467: on horses in the army), M² (i. 475: on the royal chapel at Windsor) and N² (i. 509: on Bourges cathedral), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX O²

(Vol. ii. p. 7)

CHEF DE CAUX

For the Pagus Caletanus (i.e. the district of the Caleti of Caesar, Bell. Gall. ii. 4), see *Mém. de la Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, xi. 11. Chef de Caux is spelt in a great variety of ways by fifteenth-century writers. Some of the more striking forms may be given.

Quie de Caux (Cagny, 94); Chief or Chiesf de Caux (Cochon, 123; Norm. Chron. 168; C. Beaurepaire, Notes, iii. 267); Chiefe de Cauxe or Calx (Kingsford, First Life, 33, 34); Kyef de Caux (Orig. Lett., Ser. II, i. 84); Ketecaus (Harflet, 307); Ki de Caws, or Kydecause (Gesta, 13; Chron. Giles, 13; Strecche, 268; Capr., de Illustr. 115; Wals. ii. 307; Caxton, Chron. 145); Kidcaus, Kydcaws, Kyddecause, Kidecaws (Elmham, Lib. Metr. 106; Capgr. 310; Caxton, 225; Vita, 37, 38); Kitcaws, Kytkawys (Greg. Chron. 109; Brut, ii. 376); Kittance (Brut, ii. 553); Kedecaus, Kedcaux, Kedecause, Kedecaws, Kedicaux, Kedekaws (Chron. Lond. 100; Kingsford, Lit. 350; Worcester, Itin. 372; Noblesse, 28; Grey Friars Chron. 13; Gale, Scriptores, i. 500; Kingsford, Chron. 70; Stow, Chron. 347); Kittecaus, Kitcaux, Kytcaus (Hardyng, 389; Chron. Ric. II—Hen. VI, p. 40; Godstow, 211); Kitcawe (Kingsford, Lit. 316, 325); Kydecamp (Otterbourne, 276).

[Doubtless many of these forms represent attempts to reproduce phonetically the name as pronounced by Henry's soldiers. The censors of our own time might furnish as many and strange variants of Ypres or Armentières.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX P²

(Vol. ii. p. 8)

HARFLEUR AND HONFLEUR

For variations in the spelling of the name Harfleur, see Cochet, Seine Inférieure, 179; Morlent, ii. 74.

[To the examples there given, Dr Wylie's notes add upwards of sixty, taken from mediæval sources, mainly of the fifteenth century. About half of them retain the original "t" in the second syllable, forms approximating to Harflet and Hareflete being numerous. In many instances, however, the "t" has disappeared, without being replaced by another consonant: forms like Harreflew and Harefieu are thus produced. The intrusion of an "r" into the second syllable is comparatively rare, and occurs largely in works by writers who are neither French nor English. We find, however, Hariflorium (St Denys, v. 540, vi. 100; Rym. ix. 387), Harrefleur (Débat, 27), Auriflorium (St Denys, v. 532), Arrefleur (Martial,

i. 19), Arfleur (Verneuil Chron. 217), Harefleur (c. 1404: Margry, 184).

Dr Wylie noted some twenty variants of the spelling of Honfleur. Here again the "t" of the second syllable is retained by a large proportion of the authorities: thus Blondel, ii. 153, has Honnofluctus, while Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1184, gives Hundflet. Apparently, however, it was more usual in the fifteenth century to spell the word with no consonant at the end of the second syllable: "Honnefleu" and forms resembling it are common. The "r" nevertheless appears in Honoflorium and Onoflorium (St Denys, vi. 42, 100, 144), Honnefleur (Juv. 535; Verneuil Chron. 217; C. Beaurepaire, Notes, iii. 258), and Aunfleur (Longnon, Entrée, 107).—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX Q²

(Vol. ii. p. 9)

MONTIVILLIERS

Montivilliers is variously called Monasterium Villarum (Cochet, Seine Inf. 176), Monasterium Villare (Blondel, Reductio, 151; Morlent, Havre, ii. 90, Arrondiss. xii; C. Beaurepaire, Notes, ii. 19; Gall. Christ. xi. 281); Monstievillier (La Trémoille, 70); Monstievilliers (Gesta, 277); Monstrevilliers (ibid. 37); Monstrevilliers (Norm. Chron. 176); Moostervellers (Kingsford, Chron. 119); Monstrevilges (Kingsford, First Life, 35); Musterdevillers, Mustherdevillers (Vita, 40, 42); Mosterdewellers (Gesta, 129, 130); Musterdevillers (Hardyng, 378); Mosterevellers (Pol. Songs, ii. 123).

[For APPENDIX R² (ii. 11: on the port of Leure), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX S²

(Vol. ii. p. 32)

VEGETIUS

Vegetius was the only writer on military science studied in the Middle Ages. His work *De Re Militari* was translated by Jean de Meung in 1284 under the title of "L'art de la Chevalerie" (Leroux de Lincy, Bibl. 71; Delisle, Cabinet, i. 106, Recherches, i. 273; Boutaric, 297) and versified by Jean Priorat as "L'ordre de Chevalerie." In 1285 Gilles de Colonna incorporated a great part of it in his *De Regimine Principum*. MSS. of the work are not uncommon. For one belonging to Thomas duke of Gloucester in 1397, see Dillon-Hope, 281. There is another at All Souls College, Oxford (MS. xcii, see Coxe, ii. 28) and one, formerly

at Westminster, in Lambeth Palace (Robinson and James, 24). The *De Re Militari* was also translated by Christine de Pisan as "*Le Livre des faits d'Armes et de Chevalerie*," or "*Le Livre de Chevalerie*" (Robineau, 251; Petit de Julleville, ii. 365; Guiffrey, i. 270, where it is presented by her to the duke of Berry on Jan. 1, 1413). This version can hardly have been known in England at the time of the siege of Harfleur.

APPENDIX T²

(Vol. ii. p. 33)

GUNS AND GUNPOWDER

[Dr Wylie's papers contain no material that could be printed as an appendix on this subject.—w. t. w.]

For APPENDIX U² (ii. 47: on John Phelip) and V² (ii. 108: Blanche-Tache), Dr Wylie's papers contained no serviceable material.—w. t. w.]

APPENDIX W²

(Vol. ii. p. 126)

COAT-ARMOUR

[Dr Wylie left some notes justifying his use of the term coat-armour by quotations from sources of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The following will serve as examples: "a vesture which that men clepen a cotearmure," Chaucer, *House of Fame*, i. 3233; "by hir cotearmures and by hir gere," Chaucer, *Knight's Tale*, 1018, 2502; "cote armure over his hernais," *ibid.* 2142; "three cote armures," *Brit. Mus. Add. MS.* 4601, f. 95 (122); "one cote armour," Amyot, 256; *Antiq. Repert.* ii. 277; "tunicas armorum vocatas coatarmures," *Rym.* ix. 457.

Dr Wylie also made some notes on the history of the military surcoat, but they contain no information which is not given in "*Mediaeval England*" (ed. Davis), 177 sqq.

For APPENDIX X² (ii. 133: on dismounted troops at Agincourt), Dr Wylie's papers contain no material.

After p. 133 there are no references in vol. ii. to any further appendices, though in several notes the reader is directed to consult certain earlier ones. Dr Wylie's papers show, however, that in some of these cases he really meant to provide an additional appendix, which he would doubtless have furnished with a distinctive description. Thus APPENDIX H, referred to in ii. 142, 183, is not the one on Queen Isabel cited in i. 71, but was intended to deal with estimates of the numbers at Agincourt. Some of Dr Wylie's notes for this appendix may be reproduced.—w. t. w.]

Among fifteenth-century estimates of the numbers of the French army may be mentioned the following: 10,000 men-at-arms (Gilles, ii. 61; Fabyan, 580); 10,000 altogether (Gruel, 18); 40,000 (Aen. Syl., Orat. iii. 191; Fabyan, 579, for total of fighting men); 50,000 (Le Fèvre, i. 247; Waurin, ii. 205); 60,000 (Gesta, 57; Otterbourne, 277; Usk, 126; Lib. Metr. 120; Pol. Songs, ii. 124; Capgr., de Illustr. 116; Kingsford, Chron. 119; Chron. Lond. 159; Greg. Chron. 111); 80,000 (Kingsford, Chron. 70, Lit. 277; Caxton, Polychron. 227); 100,000 (Rym. ix. 315; Bréquigny, 247; Strecche, 267 b; Kingsford, Lit. 286, 317, 326; Hardyng, 375, 391; Lansdowne MS. 1054; Salisbury Corporation Records, Ledger A, 1, f. 55 in Hist. MSS. Rept., Var. Coll. iv. 195; Pluscard. i. 350; Bouvier, 430); 101,000 (Kingsford, First Life, 52); 120,000 (Chron. Ric. II—Hen. VI, p. 41; Chron. Lond. 101; Brut, ii. 379, 555; Verneuil Chron. 217); 140,000 (Wals. ii. 310; Niem, Vita, 35); 150,000 (Monstr. 373 n.; [Coll. of Arms, MS. M. 9, f. xxxiii]); 200,000 (Scotichron. (Hearne), iv. 1185); 1,200,000, i.e. *sixti score M*¹ (Brut, ii. 597).

[As for APPENDIX L, referred to in ii. 151, and 178, n. 2, I am at a loss. It is certainly not to be identified with the Appendix L referred to in i. 173. It appears however that the APPENDIX L of ii. 178, n. 6, was to deal with the name Agincourt. Concerning this Dr Wylie had written the following note: "It has been customary to suppose that the name Agincourt is a modern English corruption of the French word Azincourt. . . . But this is altogether disproved by the earliest instances in which the name occurs," which show the 'g' as an essential part of the pronunciation, with the accent usually on the penultimate, e.g.

"Regi Londonias ab Agincourt advenienti, Elmham, Lib. Metr. 125.
 Slus, Pictanense, simul Agincourt memorantur, *ibid.* 131.
 Heu nimis Octobri Gallos confregit Agincourt, Mont-St-Michel, i. 20.
 Henricus quintus rus Agyncurtum fuit intus, Monast. iii. 129.
 Agencourt nomen ubi Christus dedit omen, Lambeth MS. 84, f. 195.
 To Agyncourt now as he is ride, Harflet, 67.
 Til he come to Agincourt cost, *ibid.*
 In Agincourt feld he fought manly, *ibid.*
 At Agyncourt so homeward in his waye, *ibid.*"

Dr Wylie gives further examples of fifteenth-century spellings of the name. The following are of special interest: Agincourt (Le Fèvre, i. 269; St Denys, vi. 466; Norm. Chron. 170, Hellot, 28; Blondel, i. 313, 314, 442, 443; Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 17,716, f. 102; Ruisseauville, 141); Agencourt (Rym. ix. 457; Hunter, Agincourt, 11, 19; Ord. Priv. Co. ii. 229); Agimcort (Bec Chron. 81); Agincort (Gesta, 49, 107; Stevenson, Wars, ii. 441, 454); Agyncourt (Rym. ix. 319; Rot. Parl. iv. 320; Rot. Norm., Hardy, 246, 277; Kingsford, Lit. 326); Achencourt (Strecche, 267 a); Egincourt (Bourgeois, 134); Gyncourt (Cagny, 97, 99; Verneuil Chron. 218; Débat, 8). On the other hand, the form Azencourt occurs in Chanc. Warr., Ser. 1, 664/659; Rym. ix. 357; Azyncorte in Pol. Songs, ii. 124; Kingsford, Chron. 119; Azincourt

in *Le Fèvre*, i. 241; *Waurin*, ii. 204, 230; *Chast.* i. 159; *Fenin*, 65; *Cousinot*, 134; *Dynter*, iii. 246, 303; *Aisincourt* in *Cordeliers*, 229. But the balance of evidence is in favour of the spelling with "g."

The APPENDIX M referred to in ii. 182 was apparently to be concerned with the Agincourt casualties. It is doubtful, however, whether Dr Wylie would have written this Appendix; at any rate, most of his notes on the subject have been embodied in the text or foot-notes of vol. ii., and the rest do not throw much additional light on the subject.

The reference to APPENDIX C² in ii. 193 I cannot explain. APPENDIX N, referred to in ii. 195, was to give some account of the *Chronique de Ruisseauville*. According to Dr Wylie the dialect in which this work is written indicates that it originated in Ponthieu, Picardy, or Artois. In both form and matter it occasionally shows strong affinities to *Le Fèvre*, *Monstrelet* and the *Cordeliers Chronicle*; but the general independence of the writer is such that he cannot be supposed to have copied from them. There is no doubt that the chronicle is of fairly early date, but it seems very doubtful whether it was written at Ruisseauville (as stated by N. Lambert, 418; Belleval, 39): it asserts, for instance, that the English crossed the Somme at Doingt, which is not actually on the river, and describes Agincourt as "un lieu que l'on dist Agincourt-en-Ternois." The writer says that the consecration of the ground in which the dead were buried was performed by the abbot of Blangy, contradicting *Monstrelet's* assertion that it was the abbot of Ruisseauville who officiated. Not only does the writer exhibit no animosity towards the English, but he goes out of his way to denounce the Armagnacs for robbing the fugitives from Harfleur and plundering towns, churches, and monasteries.—w. t. w.]

[APPENDIX Y²

ROBERT REDMAN'S "VITA HENRICI QUINTI"

No references to Redman's *Life of Henry V* have been made in vol. iii. Dr R. R. Reed has shown (*E.H.R.* xxx. 691 sqq.) that the *Life* was not written in the reign of Henry VIII but in that of Elizabeth, probably between 1574 and 1578. Redman (or Redmayne) was thus in a position to use Halle and Stow, and his work consequently has no independent value whatever. Miss Reed thinks that the author is to be identified with the Robert Redmayne who was chancellor of the diocese of Norwich from 1587 to 1625, when he died at the age of seventy-four.—w. t. w.]

[APPENDIX Z²

THE FIRST ENGLISH LIFE OF HENRY V

“The First English Life of King Henry the Fifth,” recovered and edited by Mr C. L. Kingsford, was not published till 1911, when Dr Wylie’s researches were far advanced. Dr Wylie of course knew the book and his foot-notes often refer to it; but it seems that he had not studied it very closely or formed a critical estimate of its value. Indeed its interest and importance have never received proper recognition.

In his excellent Introduction to the “Life” Mr Kingsford described its character and contents and showed its influence on later historical writings. It is a compilation, based mainly on the Latin Life of Henry by Titus Livius of Forli and the Chronicle of Monstrelet. The author, who modestly styles himself “the Translator”—though he was much more—supplemented his two principal sources with extracts from one or two English chronicles, especially the Polychronicon, as printed by Caxton in 1482. In the passages taken from these sources the “Life” of course tells us nothing that was not familiar before its recovery. But, in addition, the biographer has inserted in his work “diuers other opinions,” for which he was indebted to an earl of Ormonde: and it is in these that the value of the book consists.

The “First Life” was used by Nicholas Harpsfield, Stow, Holinshed (to whom Stow lent his copy), and Hearne, who cites it in the notes to his edition of Livius. The work is now extant in two MSS.—Bodley, 966, and Harley, 35, both written in the reign of James I. The Harley MS. is much inferior to the other, lacking the “Proem” and four of the passages for which Ormonde is named as the authority in the Bodley MS. Stow’s copy has vanished. It evidently differed in important respects from both of the extant versions. Apparently several MSS. of the work existed early in the sixteenth century, and it is strange that it was never printed until our own time. That it was lost for nearly 200 years was due to misdescription by Bernard and the compilers of the catalogue of the Harleian manuscripts.

Mr Kingsford rightly emphasised the importance of the “Ormonde” passages. From the earl the biographer derived his statement that from his accession to his marriage Henry remained unimpeachably continent—an assertion which before the recovery of the “First Life” was believed to rest on the authority of Harpsfield. It was probably from the earl that the “Translator” had the story of Henry’s coming in fantastic disguise to seek forgiveness from his father; and Ormonde is expressly named as the source of the report of Henry IV’s dying advice to his son. It used to be impossible to trace these accounts further back than Stow. In the next passage, given on Ormonde’s authority, the writer tells how, when prince of Wales, Henry, “accompanied with some of his younge Lords and gentlemen, would awaite in disguised aray for his owne receauers and

distres them of their money"; it was probably, too, from Ormonde that the biographer had the story of Henry's dismissal of his wild companions. That Henry suddenly reformed his conduct when he became king is attested by many good authorities, but the charge that he had been guilty of highway-robbery used to be supported by no one earlier than Stow, and it was formerly thought that his repudiation of his old friends was attested by no independent witness save Fabyan. The story that Henry tried, though unsuccessfully, to found a house of Celestines at Isleworth, is peculiar to the "First Life"; it is derived from Ormonde. The earl, too, is made responsible for the story that when Sigismund arrived at Dover, Gloucester and other magnates insisted on his giving an assurance that he came as arbitrator and not as emperor—a tale generally discredited as resting on no better authority than Holinshed. Coming to the invasion of Normandy in 1417, we find Ormonde cited as the source of a story, not otherwise known, about the division of the spoil after the capture of Caen. There is, too, a long account of the visit to Henry of Vincent Ferrer; the particulars given are new and interesting, though the earl was wrong in placing the incident at Rouen instead of Caen. Finally, the earl is cited for the story that Barbazan, the defender of Melun, having been condemned to death for complicity in the murder of John the Fearless, saved himself by the plea that by his combat with Henry in the mine he had become the king's brother-in-arms. This is told in an abridged form by Holinshed, but, while the "First Life" was lost, his reference to a "translator of Livius" as his authority carried little weight, since no one knew who the translator was.

One effect of the recovery of the "First Life" should be an increase in the respect paid to Stow and Holinshed. The more one learns of their methods, the more one admires the scrupulous way in which they handled their sources. When they make statements for which as yet no earlier authority has been found, one may feel confident that they were using some written source and reproducing it faithfully. It does not follow, however, that their authorities were always historically valuable; and we must now ask how much weight is to be attached to the information of the "Translator's" earl of Ormonde.

For his account of the young Henry's reconciliation with his father, Stow refers to the "translator of Titus Livius. . . as he was informed by the Earle of Ormond, an eye witness of the same." Stow thus has in mind James Buder, the fourth earl, who was born in 1392, succeeded to the title in 1405, and died in 1452; and it is true that he might have been at court on the occasion in question. Mr Kingsford accepted the identification, apparently without misgiving or hesitation, and consequently regarded the passages derived from Ormonde as possessing all the weight of contemporary evidence.

This assumption soon got Mr Kingsford into difficulties. As he himself pointed out (p. x), the Proem and Epilogue of the "First Life" leave no doubt that it was composed between June 30, 1513, and the autumn of the following year. The writer, therefore, could hardly have derived

the "Ormonde" stories from the mouth of the fourth earl, and Mr Kingsford consequently assumes that they must have been taken from a written source. Of this, however, the fourth earl could not have been the author, for one of the passages which the "First Life" derives from him contains a reference to the canonisation of Vincent Ferrer in 1455. So Mr Kingsford was driven to postulate the existence of a Life of Henry V written after 1455 by a servant of the fourth earl, who relied on information which he had received from his late master.

The whole of this theory I believe to lack warrant. It depends on the identification of the "Translator's" earl of Ormonde with the fourth earl. For that I have found no evidence save the statement of Stow cited above. In neither extant MS. of the biography does it receive any support whatever. On the other hand, there is much evidence against it.

In the Proem (p. 3) the author writes that to the matter taken from sources previously specified he has added "diuers other opinions that I haue reade of the report of a certaine and honourable auncient person, to whom as me seemeth for the grauitie and experience credit is to be giuen. And that is the honororable Erle of Ormonde." Introducing the report of Henry IV's last words to his son (p. 13), he says, "I remember also to haue heard of the credible report of my saide Lorde and Mr the Earle of Ormond." The account of Henry V's youthful excesses (p. 17) he says he "learned of the credence before rehearsed." The story about the Celestines (p. 20), he had "hearde of the tofore credible reportes." He narrates what happened at Sigismund's landing (p. 67), "as I haue heard the tofore rehersed the Honorable Earle of Ormonde saye that he hearde of credible reporte." He tells of the distribution of the booty at Caen (p. 92), "as I haue heard of the report of the tofore named Earle of Ormond." Similarly, concerning Vincent Ferrer and Barbazan, he tells what he had "heard" from the earl of Ormonde.

There can be no doubt that all these references have to do with one and the same earl, and anyone encountering them with no preconceived opinions about their contents would naturally suppose the earl mentioned to be the one living when these passages were penned. That is to say, the "Translator's" informant was not the long-dead fourth earl James, but the living seventh earl Thomas. Thomas was James's youngest son, the earldom having been held in succession by his two elder brothers. In 1514 he was about ninety years old, and he died in the next year. He had been a Lancastrian in the Wars of the Roses, though he made his peace with Edward IV. Under the Tudors he rose to high favour, and on Henry VIII's accession became Lord Chamberlain to Queen Catherine (G.E.C. 1st ed. vi. 142 sq.). There is nothing whatever in the "First Life" or his career to forbid the identification of him with the source of the Ormonde stories.

It may be urged also that had it been the fourth earl who supplied the biographer with information, one would have looked for something different from what actually appears. Earl James took part in the Agincourt campaign (First Life, p. xvii), yet from the earl of Ormonde the author of

the "First Life" seems to have learned nothing about it. He was, too, at the siege of Rouen, but the one Ormonde story concerning it is false, for Vincent Ferrer never went there. On the other hand, the "Translator's" informant had something to tell of the siege of Caen, at which the fourth earl seems not to have been present. And regarding the story about Barbazan, the biographer says that he had "often" heard the earl "report" it "by the opinion of the Frenchmen, as he learned in the time of his sojourn amongst them." James Butler, a contemporary of everything recounted in the story, would not have depended for his knowledge of the facts "on the opinion of the Frenchmen"; they must have been well known in English military circles. There, however, they may well have faded from memory by the time that Thomas Butler went to France to escape the worst consequences of his attainder.

If the seventh earl was the source of the Ormonde stories they of course lack some of the authority they would have possessed had they come directly from the fourth earl. Thomas Butler was not born until Henry V was dead. Still, his reminiscences stretched back a long way from 1514, and his father had not died till he was nearly thirty years old. We may well believe that many of the things which he told the "Translator" had been told to him by the fourth earl, Henry V's contemporary. In any case it is probable that the stories we have been discussing were current by the middle of the fifteenth century.

There remains the question whether the author of the "First Life" had the Ormonde "reports" in writing. In the Proem, as we have seen, he refers to "opinions that I have reade of the report" of the earl of Ormonde. Elsewhere, however, he never speaks of "reading" information derived from Ormonde, but only of hearing or learning it; he even says (p. 13) that he remembered hearing what Ormonde told of Henry IV's last words. The Rev. F. W. Weaver, who at my request most kindly collated the printed version with the Bodley MS., found that the word "reade" in the Proem had been correctly transcribed; and since the Proem is missing from the Harley MS. that reading consequently holds the field. Nevertheless, in view of the reiteration of the word "hear" in the other references to Ormonde, I strongly suspect that the author originally wrote not "reade" but "heard." It seems clear, at all events, that most of Ormonde's information came to the "Translator" by word of mouth.

Had I foreseen the early death of Mr Kingsford, I would have published this appendix elsewhere some time ago; and I deeply regret that, owing to a series of mischances, I was prevented from fulfilling my intention of discussing with him the points I have raised.—w. r. w.]

LIST OF PRINTED BOOKS TO WHICH REFERENCE
IS MADE

- Abram, A. *Social Life in the Fifteenth Century*. London, 1909.
 — *English Life and Manners in the Later Middle Ages*. London, 1913.
 Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. *Mémoires*. Paris, 1844, &c.
 Académie Impériale de Reims. *Travaux*. Rheims, 1870, &c.
 Academy, The. London, 1869, &c.
 Acta Sanctorum. Ed. J. Bollandus, &c. Antwerp, Brussels, Paris, 1643-1887.
 Acts of the Parliaments of Scotland. 12 vols. London, 1844, &c.
 Acts of the Privy Council of England. New Series. London, 1890, &c.
 Adams, W. H. D. *Memorable Battles in English History*. 2 vols. London, 1879.
 — *Battle Stories from British and European History*. London, 1883.
 Adeline, J. *Rouen au XVI^e siècle d'après le MS. de Jacques le Lieur*. Rouen, 1891.
 — *Les Quais de Rouen autrefois et aujourd'hui*. Rouen, 1880.
 Adler, M. *The History of the Domus Conversorum from 1290 to 1891*. (Jewish Historical Society.) London, 1899.
 Aegidius Romanus (Gilles de Colonna, 1247-1316). *Libellus de Re Militari Veterum*. In S. F. Hahn, *Collectio Monumentorum veterum et recentium ineditorum*, vol. i. Brunswick, 1724.
 — *De Regimine Principum* lib. iii. Rome, 1607.
 Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini (Pius II, 1405-1464). *Opera*. Basle, 1551.
 — *Historia Bohemica*. Helmstadt, 1699.
 — *Commentarii Rerum Memorabilium quae Temporibus suis contigerunt*. Frankfurt, 1614.
 — *Orationes politicae et ecclesiasticae*. 3 vols. Lucca, 1755-9.
 — *Amores Euriali et Lucretiae*. In S. F. Hahn, *Collectio Monumentorum*, vol. i. Brunswick, 1724.
 Affré, H. *Archives Communales: Ville de Rodez*. Rodez, 1877.
 — *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Aveyron*. 2 vols. Paris, 1866-7.
 Affry de la Monnoye, A. d'. *Les Jetons de l'Échevinage de Paris*. Paris, 1878.
 Ainger, A. *Lectures and Essays*. 2 vols. London, 1905.
 Airy, O. *Text-book of English History*. 2 vols. London, 1893-4.
 Alart, B. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives du Département de Pyrénées-Orientales*. 2 vols. Paris, 1868, 1877.
 Albert-Petit, A. *Histoire de Normandie*. Paris, 1911.
 Albizzi, Rinaldo degli (1370-1452). *Commissioni di par il Comune di Firenze* (1399-1433). Ed. G. Guasti. 3 vols. Florence, 1867.
 Alcock, D. *Crushed yet Conquering. A story of Constance and Bohemia*. London, 1891.
 Allen, L. *History of Portsmouth*. London, 1817.
 Allen, T. (1803-1833). *History and Antiquities of London, Westminster, Southwark, and Parts adjacent*. 5 vols. London, 1827-37.
 Allgemeine deutsche Biographie. 56 vols. Leipzig, 1875, &c.
 Allies, M. A. *Three Catholic Reformers of the 15th Century*. London, 1878.
 Alpartil, M. de (d. 1440). *Chronica Actitatorum temporibus Domini Benedicti XIII*. Ed. F. Ehrle. Paderborn, 1906.

450 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Altmann, W. Die Urkunden Kaiser Sigmunds (1410-1437). In J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta Imperii*. 2 vols. Innsbruck, 1896-7.
- Ametller y Vinyas, J. Alfonso V de Aragon en Italia y la Crisis religiosa del Siglo xv. 2 vols. Gerona, 1903, 1904.
- Amiot, G. Inventaire analytique des Archives de la Ville de Cherbourg. Cherbourg, 1900.
- Amundesham, J. (c. 1450). *Annales Monasterii S. Albani*. Ed. H. T. Riley. R.S. 2 vols. London, 1870-1.
- Amyot, T. Transcript of two Rolls containing an inventory of Effects formerly belonging to Sir John Fastolfe. In *Archaeologia*, vol. xxi. London, 1827.
- Ancestor, The. 12 vols. London, 1902-5.
- Ancient Correspondence of the Chancery and Exchequer preserved in the Public Record Office, List of. London, 1902.
- Ancient Deeds in the Public Record Office, Catalogue of. 3 vols. London, 1890-1900.
- Andeli, H. d' (c. 1250). *Œuvres*. Ed. A. Héron. Paris, 1881.
- Le Lai d'Aristote. Ed. A. Héron. Rouen, 1901.
- Andersen, H. C. In Sweden. London, 1852.
- Anderson, J. (1662-1728). *Selectus Diplomatum et Numismatum Scotiæ Thesaurus*. Edinburgh, 1739.
- Andrews, J. P. *History of Great Britain*. 2 vols. London, 1794.
- Andrieu, J. *Histoire de l'Agenais*. 2 vols. Agen, 1892.
- Androuet du Cerceau, J. (d. 1592). *Les plus excellents Bastiments de France*. 2 vols. Paris, 1576, 1579.
- Anglia. *Zeitschrift für Englische Philologie*. Halle, 1877, &c.
- Anglia Sacra. H. Wharton. 2 vols. London, 1691.
- Angure, O. (c. 1400). *Le Saint Voyage de Jerusalem*. Ed. F. Bonnardot and A. Longnon. Soc. des Anciens Textes Français. Paris, 1878.
- [Anjou Lett.] *Letters of Queen Margaret of Anjou and others*. Ed. C. Munro. Camden Soc. London, 1863.
- [Ann.] *Annales Ricardi II et Henrici IV (1392-1406)*. Ed. H. T. Riley. R.S. London, 1866.
- Annales Bourbonnais*. Moulins, 1887, &c.
- Annales du Midi*. *Revue archéologique, historique et philologique de la France méridionale*. Toulouse, Paris, 1889, &c.
- Anquetil, L. P. (1723-1808). *Histoire de France*. 2 vols. Paris, 1837.
- Anselme, de la Vierge Marie (Pierre de Guibours, 1625-1694). *Histoire généalogique et chronologique de la maison royale de France*. 9 vols. Paris, 1726-33.
- Anson, W. R. *The Law and Custom of the Constitution*. 3 vols. London, 1909.
- Anstis, J. (1669-1744). *Register of the Order of the Garter*. 2 vols. London, 1724.
- *Observations Introductory to an Historical Essay upon the Knighthood of the Bath*. London, 1725.
- Antiquarian Repertory*. Ed. F. Grose and T. Astle. 4 vols. London, 1807-9.
- Antiquary, The*. London, 1880, &c.
- Antonio, N. (1617-1684). *Bibliotheca Hispana Vetus*. 2 vols. Madrid, 1788.
- Appleyard, E. S. *Welsh Sketches*. 3 vols. London, 1852-3.
- Arbois de Jubainville, H. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Aube*. 3 vols. Troyes, 1864, &c.
- *Répertoire archéologique du Département de l'Aube*. Paris, 1861.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 451

- Arbois de Jubainville, H. *Histoire des Ducs et des Comtes de Champagne*. 7 vols. Paris, 1859-69.
- Archaeologia; or, Miscellaneous Tracts relating to Antiquity. 39 vols. London, 1770, &c.
- Archaeologia Cambrensis. London, 1846, &c.
- Archaeologia Cantiana. London, 1858, &c.
- Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. Proceedings. London, 1846, &c.
- Archaeological Journal. London, 1844, &c.
- Archives historiques, artistiques, et littéraires. 2 vols. Paris, 1889-91.
- Archon, L. (1645-1717). *Histoire de la Chapelle des Rois de France*. 2 vols. Paris, 1704-11.
- Arderne, J. (b. 1307, d. after 1377). *Treatises of Fistula in Ano, Haemorrhoids, and Clysters*. Ed. D'Arcy Power. E.E.T.S. London, 1910.
- Ardouin-Dumazel, V. C. *Voyage en France*. 20 vols. Paris, 1893-1903.
- Arenijs, P. (b. 1349, d. after 1415). *Chronicle* (extracts from). Ed. H. Denifle. In *Archiv für Litteratur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. iii. Berlin, 1887.
- Aretinus (or Leonardo Bruni) (1369-1444). *Rerum suo tempore gestarum commentarius*. In Muratori, vol. xix.
- *Epistolarum Libri octo*. Ed. J. R. Fabricius. Hamburg, 1724.
- Argenté, B. (1519-1590). *Histoire de Bretagne*. Paris, 1618.
- Arnold's History Readers. 7 books. London, 1894.
- Arnold-Foster, H. O. *A History of England*. London, 1903.
- Arras, Jean d' (fl. 1394). *Melusine*. Ed. C. Brunet. Paris, 1854. English version. Ed. A. K. Donald. E.E.T.S. London, 1899.
- [Arundel MSS.] *Catalogue of Manuscripts in the British Museum. New Series*, vol. i, part 1: the Arundel Manuscripts. London, 1834.
- Aschbach, J. (b. 1801). *Geschichte Kaiser Sigmunds*. 4 vols. Hamburg, 1838-45.
- Ashbee, C. R. *Survey of London*. London, 1900, &c.
- Ashdown, Mrs C. H. *British Costume during Nineteen Centuries*. London, 1910.
- Ashmole, E. (1617-1692). *The Institution, Laws and Ceremonies of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*. London, 1672.
- *History of the Order of the Garter*. London, 1715.
- Assier, A. *Une Cité Champenoise au xv^e siècle*. Paris, 1875.
- Assmann, W. *Geschichte des Mittelalters*. 4 vols. Brunswick, 1875-1906.
- Astesan, A. (1412-after 1466). *De Varietate Fortunae*. In Muratori, vol. xiv.
- Athenaeum, The. London, 1828, &c.
- Atkinson, T. D. *Cambridge described and illustrated*. London, 1897.
- Atkyns, Robt. (1646-1711). *The Ancient and Present State of Glostershire*. London, 1712.
- Aubert, F. *Le Parlement de Paris (1314-1422): son Organisation*. Paris, 1887.
- *Le Parlement de Paris: sa Compétence et ses Attributions*. Paris, 1890.
- *Histoire du Parlement de Paris de l'origine à François I.* 2 vols. Paris, 1894.
- Aubrey, J. (1626-1697). *The Natural History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey*. 5 vols. London, 1719.
- *Topographical collections for Wiltshire (1659-1670)*. Ed. J. E. Jackson. 1 vol. Devizes, 1862.

452 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Aubrey, W. H. I. *The National and Domestic History of England*. 4 vols. London, 1878–86.
- *The Rise and Growth of the English Nation*. 3 vols. London, 1895.
- Auden, G. A. *Historical and Scientific Survey of York and District*. York, 1906.
- Aufauvre, A. *Troyes et ses Environs*. Troyes, 1860.
- Aufauvre, A. and Fichot, C. *Les Monuments de Seine-et-Marne*. Paris, 1858.
- Aumâle, H., Duke of (1822–1897). *Notes et Documents relatifs à Jean roi de France et sa captivité*. Paris, 1824.
- Aungier, G. J. *Chroniques de Londres*. Camden Society. London, 1844.
- Aussy, D. de. *La Saintonge pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans (1372–1453)*. La Rochelle, 1894.
- *Registres de l'échevinage de St Jean d'Angély*. Paris, 1895–1902.
- Avesbury, Robert of (d. after 1350). *De Gestis Mirabilibus Regis Edwardi Tertii*. Ed. E. M. Thompson. R.S. London, 1889.
- Awans, R. d', and Lameere, E. *Histoire de Belgique*. Brussels, 1890.
- Axon, W. E. A. *Lancashire Gleanings*. Manchester, 1883.
- Ayroles, J. B. G. *La vraie Jeanne d'Arc*. 5 vols. Paris, 1890–1902.
- Azurara, G. E. (c. 1400–after 1472). *Chronicle of the Discovery and Conquest of Guinea*. Tr. C. R. Beasley and E. Prestage. Hakluyt Society. 2 vols. London, 1896–9.
- Babeau, A. *Le Louvre et son Histoire*. Paris, 1895.
- Baedecker, K. *Le Centre de la France*. Leipzig, 1889.
- Baena, J. A. (d. after 1449), *El Cancionero de*. Ed. F. Michel. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1860.
- Baeske, W. *Oldcastle—Falstaff in der englischen Litteratur bis zu Shakespeare*. In *Palästra*, vol. I. Berlin, 1905.
- Baildon, W. P. *A Wardrobe Account of 16–17 Richard II*. In *Archaeologia*, vol. lxii. Oxford, 1911.
- *Select Cases in Chancery (1364–1471)*. Selden Society. London, 1896.
- *The Site of Lincoln's Inn*. London, 1902.
- *The Court of the Star Chamber*. London, 1894.
- *Three Inventories*. In *Archaeologia*, vol. lxi. London, 1908.
- Bailhache, J. *La Monnaie de St Lô*. In *Revue Numismatique*, ser. iv, vol. xxviii. Paris, 1925.
- Bailly, A. (d. 1851). *Histoire Financière de la France*. 2 vols. Paris, 1830.
- Baines, E. *History of the County of Lancaster*. London, 1868.
- Baker, G. (1781–1851). *History of Northamptonshire*. 2 vols. London, 1822–41.
- Baker, G. le, de Swynebroke (c. 1350). *Chronicon*. Ed. E. M. Thompson. Oxford, 1889.
- Baker, Sir R. (1568–1645). *A Chronicle of the Kings of England*. London, 1653.
- Baldwin, J. F. *The Scutage and Knight Service in England*. Chicago, 1897.
- *Antiquities of the King's Council*. In *English Historical Review*, vol. xxi. London, 1906.
- *The King's Council in England during the Middle Ages*. Oxford, 1913.
- Bale, J. (1495–1563). *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*. In *Anecdota Oxoniensia*. Ed. R. L. Poole. Oxford, 1902.
- *Select Works of*. Parker Society. Cambridge, 1849.
- *Brefe Chronycle of Sir Johan Oldcastle*. In *Harleian Miscellany*, vol. ii.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 453

- Ballin, A. G. Renseignements sur le Château de Rouen. In *Précis Analogique des Travaux de l'Académie royale de Rouen* (anno 1841). Rouen, 1842.
- Baluze, E. (1630-1718). *Histoire Généalogique de la Maison d'Auvergne*. 2 vols. Paris, 1708.
- Banks, T. C. *Dormant and Extinct Baronage*. 4 vols. London, 1807.
- Bapst, C. G. *Testament du roi Jean le Bon et Inventaire de ses Joyaux à Londres*. Paris, 1884.
- Barante, A. G. P. (1782-1866). *Histoire des Ducs de Bourgogne*. 10 vols. Brussels, 1835. Ed. L. P. Gachard. 3 vols. Brussels, 1838.
- Barbazan, E. (1696-1770). *Fabliaux et Contes des Poètes Français des XI^e-XV^e siècles*. Ed. M. Méon. 4 vols. Paris, 1808.
- Barbot, A. (1566-1625). *Histoire de la Rochelle*. In *Société des Archives Historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis*, vol. xiv. Paris, 1886.
- Baring-Gould, S. *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*. London, 1881.
- *Lives of the Saints*. 16 vols. London, 1897, 1898.
- *Germany*. London, 1887.
- *In Troubadour Land. A Ramble in Provence and Languedoc*. London, 1891.
- Barland, H. (or Van Baerland) (1488-c. 1542). *Historiae Rerum gestarum a Brabantiae Ducibus*. Brussels, 1665.
- Barnard, F. P. *Companion to English History in the Middle Ages*. Oxford, 1902. New edition, entitled "*Mediæval England*." Ed. H. W. C. Davis. Oxford, 1924.
- Barnes, R. *Liber Pontificalis of Edmund Lacy Bishop of Exeter*. Exeter, 1847.
- Barreau, Abbé. *Guide du Voyageur dans la Ville de Bourges*. Bourges, 1863.
- Barrett, W. *History of Bristol*. Bristol, 1789.
- Barrière-Flavy, C. *Censier du Pays de Foix à la Fin du XI^e siècle*. Toulouse, 1898.
- *Cintegabelle au XV^e siècle*. Toulouse, 1888.
- Barrington, D. (1727-1800). *Observations on the Practice of Archery in England*. In *Archæologia*, vol. vii. London, 1785.
- Barron, O. *Fifteenth Century Costume*. In *The Ancestor*, vol. ix. Westminster, 1904.
- Barthélemy, A. *Essai sur la Monnaie Parisis*. In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. ii. Paris, 1876.
- Barthélemy, C. *Histoire de la Bretagne ancienne et moderne*. Tours, 1863.
- Bascle de Lagrèze, G. *La Navarre Française*. 2 vols. Paris, 1881, 1882.
- Basin, T. (1412-1491). *Histoire des règnes de Charles VII et de Louis XI*. Ed. J. J. Quicherat. *Soc. de l'Hist. de France*. 4 vols. Paris, 1855.
- Basler Chroniken*. Ed. A. Bernoulli. 5 vols. Leipzig, 1872-95.
- Basselin, Olivier, Vaux de Vire de. Ed. L. du Bois. Caen, 1821.
- Bastard, A. de. *Librairie de Jean de France Duc de Berry*. Paris, 1832.
- Bates, C. J. *Border Holds of Northumberland*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 1891.
- *History of Northumberland*. London, 1895.
- Bateson, M. *Catalogue of the Library of Syon Monastery, Isleworth*. Cambridge, 1898.
- *Records of the Borough of Leicester*. 2 vols. London, 1899, 1901.
- *Cambridge Guild Records*. Cambridge, 1903.
- *The English and Latin Versions of a Peterborough Court Leet, 1461*. In *English Historical Review*, vol. xix. London, 1904.
- *Borough Customs*. Selden Society. 2 vols. London, 1904-6.

454 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Batiffol, L. Le Nom de la Famille Juvénal des Ursins. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. 1. Paris, 1889.
- L'Origine Italienne des Juvénal des Ursins. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. liv. Paris, 1893.
- Jean Juvénal Prévôt des Marchandes de la Ville de Paris (1360–1436). Paris, 1894.
- Le Châtelet de Paris. In *Revue Historique*, vols. lxi, lxii. Paris, 1896.
- Baudot, J. Les Princesses Yolande et les Ducs de Bar de la Famille des Valois. Paris, 1900.
- Baudot de Juilly, N. (1678–1759). *Histoire de Charles VII.* 2 vols. Paris, 1754.
- *Histoire de Catherine de France, Reine d'Angleterre.* Paris, 1696.
- Baumgarten, P. M. Untersuchungen und Urkunden über die Camera Collegii Cardinalium für die Zeit von 1295 bis 1437. Leipzig, 1898.
- Baurein, J. (1713–1790). *Variétés Bourdeloises ou Essai historique et critique sur la Topographie ancienne et moderne du Diocèse de Bordeaux.* 4 vols. Bordeaux, 1876.
- Bauzon, L. L'Art Flamand en Bourgogne au xiv^e siècle. In *L'Art*, vol. xxxvii. Paris, 1884.
- *La Sculpture décorative.* Paris, 1892.
- Baxter, D. *Syon Abbey.* Chudleigh, 1906.
- *England's Cardinals.* London, 1903.
- Baye, N. de (c. 1364–1419). *Journal.* Ed. A. Tuetey. *Soc. de l'Hist. de France.* 2 vols. Paris, 1885–8.
- Bayle, A. *Vie de Saint Vincent Ferrier.* Paris, 1855.
- Bayley, J. *History and Antiquities of the Tower of London.* London, 1830.
- Bayly, J. A. Sparvel. *Some Historical Notes on Dartford and its Neighbourhood.* Dartford, 1876.
- Beamont, W. *Annals of the Lords of Warrington.* Chetham Society. Manchester, 1872.
- *Warrington Church Notes.* Warrington, 1878.
- Bearne, L. *Pictures of the old French Court.* London, 1900.
- Beaucourt, G. du Fresne de. *Histoire de Charles VII.* 6 vols. Paris, 1881–92.
- *Le Caractère de Charles VII.* In *Revue des Questions historiques*, vol. ix. Paris, 1870.
- *Les Chartier. Recherches sur Guillaume, Alain et Jean Chartier.* In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xxviii. Caen, 1870.
- *Le Meurtre de Montereau.* In *Revue des Questions historiques*, vol. v. Paris, 1868.
- *Discours prononcé dans l'Assemblée générale de la Société de l'Histoire de Normandie, Dec. 20, 1883.* In *Bulletin de la Société*, 1880–1883. Rouen, 1884.
- Beaufils, C. *Étude sur la Vie et les Poésies de Charles d'Orléans.* Coutances, 1861.
- Beaurepaire, C. M. de Robillard de. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives communales de la ville de Rouen. Vol. i. Délibérations, Registres, &c.* Rouen, 1887.
- *Notes historiques et archéologiques concernant le Département de la Seine Inférieure et spécialement la ville de Rouen.* 3 vols. Rouen, 1883, 1888, 1892.
- *Nouveaux Mélanges historiques et archéologiques.* Rouen, 1904.

- Beaurepaire, C. M. de Robillard de. De l'Administration de la Normandie sous la Domination anglaise, 1424, 1425, 1429. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xxiv. Paris, 1859.
- Les États de Normandie sous la Domination anglaise. Évreux, 1859.
- De la Vicomté de l'Eau de Rouen et ses Coutumes au XIII^e et XIV^e siècles. Paris, 1856.
- Accord entre les Capitaines des Parties de Bourgogne et d'Orléans (1418). In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. xxxvi. Paris, 1865.
- Notes sur les Juges et les Assesseurs du Procès de Condamnation de Jeanne d'Arc. Rouen, 1890.
- Beaurepaire, E. de Robillard de. Caen Illustré. Son Histoire, ses Monuments. Caen, 1896.
- Palynods présentés au Puy de Rouen. Recueil de Pierre Vidoue (1525). Rouen, 1897.
- Entrée de Charles VIII à Rouen en 1485. Rouen, 1902.
- Entrée de François I dans la Ville de Rouen (1517). Rouen, 1867.
- Les Vitraux peints de la Cathédrale de Bourges. Caen, 1898.
- Beauville, V. Histoire de la Ville de Montdidier. 3 vols. Paris, 1875.
- Recueil de Documents inédits concernant la Picardie. 5 vols. Paris, 1860-82.
- Beaven, A. B. The Aldermen of the City of London. 2 vols. London, 1908, 1913.
- Beazley, C. R. Prince Henry the Navigator. New York, 1895.
- The Dawn of Modern Geography. 3 vols. London, 1897-1906.
- Bec, Chroniques du. Ed. A. A. Porée. Rouen, 1883.
- Beccaria, G. Spigolature sulla vita privata di Re Martino in Sicilia. Palermo, 1894.
- Becket, Thomas, Materials for the History of. Ed. J. C. Robertson and J. B. Sheppard. R.S. 7 vols. London, 1875-85.
- Bedford, W. K. R. Blazon of Episcopacy. Oxford, 1897.
- Bedford, W. K. R. and Holbeche, R. The Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem. London, 1902.
- Bédier, J. Les Fabliaux. Paris, 1895.
- Beka, J. de, and Heda, W. Historia veterum Episcoporum Ultrajectinæ Sedis. Utrecht, 1642.
- Beku, M. Histoire de la ville de Bapaume. Arras, 1865.
- Bekynton, Thos. (c. 1440). Official Correspondence. Ed. G. Williams. R.S. 2 vols. London, 1872.
- Belfort, A. and Mirot, L. Archives de la Maison Dieu de Châteaudun. Paris, 1881.
- [Bell, Chaucer.] Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. Ed. R. Bell. 4 vols. London, 1889-92.
- Bell, N. The Royal Manor of Richmond. London, 1907.
- Bell, R. Early Ballads Illustrative of History, Traditions and Customs. London, 1864.
- Bellecombe, A. de. Mémoire pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Agenais. Auch, 1899.
- Belleforest, F. (1530-1583). Histoire des neuf roys Charles de France. Paris, 1568.
- Les Chroniques et Annales de France. Paris, 1573.
- La Cosmographie Universelle de tout le Monde. 2 vols. Paris, 1575.
- Belleval, R. de (b. 1837). Agincourt. Paris, 1865.
- La Journée de Mons en Vimeu et le Ponthieu après le Traité de Troyes. Paris, 1861.
- Lettres sur le Ponthieu. Paris, 1868.

456 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Belleval, R. de (b. 1837). *La Grande Guerre, fragments d'une Histoire de France au xiv^e et xv^e siècles.* Paris, 1862.
- Belloc, J. H. P. Paris. London, 1900.
- *The Eye Witness.* London, 1908.
- Beltz, G. F. (d. 1841). *Memorials of the Order of the Garter.* London, 1841.
- Benham, W. Old St Paul's. London, 1902.
- *Winchester.* In *Diocesan Histories.* London, 1884.
- *The Tower of London.* London, 1906.
- Benham, W. and Welch, C. H. *Mediaeval London.* London, 1901.
- Bentham, J. (1708–1794). *History and Antiquities of the Conventual and Cathedral Church of Ely, with Continuation by W. Stevenson.* 2 vols. Norwich, 1812, 1817.
- Béraud, J. B. *Histoire des Ducs de Bourbon.* 2 vols. Paris, 1835.
- Béroul-Bercastel, A. H. (1722–1794). *Histoire de l'Église.* 24 vols. Maestricht, 1778–90.
- Berger, W. *Johannes Hus und König Sigmund.* Augsburg, 1871.
- Bermondsey, *Annales Monasterii de.* Ed. H. R. Luard. R.S. London, 1866.
- Bernard, M. (1820–1882). *The Growth of Laws and Usages of War.* Oxford Essays. London, 1856.
- Bernard, P. (1640–1720). *Annales de Calais.* St Omer, 1715.
- Berriat-St Prix, J. (1769–1845). *Notice d'un Manuscrit de la Bibliothèque publique de Grenoble contenant diverses Poésies d'Antoine d'Astesan.* In *Magasin Encyclopédique, année viii, vol. i.* Paris, 1802.
- Berry. *See* Bouvier.
- Berry, H. F. *Statutes and Ordinances and Acts of the Parliament of Ireland, John to Henry V.* Dublin, 1907.
- Berthier, G. F. (1704–1782). *Histoire de l'Église Gallicane.* Brussels, 1825, &c.
- Berthoud, F. (1725–1807). *Histoire de la Mesure du temps par les Horloges.* 2 vols. Paris, 1802.
- Berty, A. (1818–1867). *Topographie historique du vieux Paris. Région du Louvre.* 3 vols. Paris, 1866–8.
- Beryn, *The Tale of.* Ed. F. J. Furnivall. Chaucer Society. London, 1870.
- Besant, W. Westminster. London, 1895.
- *The History of London.* London, 1893.
- *Survey of London.* 10 vols. London, 1902, &c.
- Besant, W. and Mitton, G. E. *Holborn and Bloomsbury.* London, 1903.
- Bess, B. *Die Verhandlungen zu Perpignan und die Schlacht bei Agincourt.* In *Historisches Jahrbuch, vol. xxii.* Munich, 1901.
- *Das Bündniss von Canterbury (Mitteilungen Inst. Österr. Geschichtsforschung, vol. xxii.* Vienna, 1901).
- Bethencourt, J. (1360–1422). *Le Canariens.* Ed. G. Gravier. Rouen, 1874.
- Beugnot, A. A. (1797–1865). *Les Olim ou Registres des arrêts rendus par la Cour du Roi (1254–1318).* Collection de Documents inédits. 4 vols. Paris, 1839–48.
- Béziers, M. (1721–1782). *Mémoires pour servir à l'État historique et géographique du Diocèse de Bayeux.* 3 vols. Rouen, 1894–6.
- *Histoire sommaire de la ville de Bayeux.* Caen, 1773.
- Bibliotheca Topographica Britannica.* 10 vols. London, 1780–95.
- Bigot, L. (1826–1872). *Jehan le Coupeur ou le siège de Soissons en 1414.* Soissons, 1877.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 457

- Binder, G. Die heilige Birgitta von Schweden und ihr Klosterorden. Munich, 1891.
- Biondi, J. F. (1572-1644). History of the Civil Warres of England. London, 1641.
- Birch, G. H. London on Thames in Byegone Days. London, 1903.
- Birch, W. de G. Early Drawings and Illuminations. London, 1879.
- Seals. London, 1907.
- Bissey, Abbé. Généalogie des Pot. In Mémoires de la Soc. d'Histoire, d'Archéologie, et de Littérature de l'Arrondissement de Beaune, 1878-9. Beaune, 1879.
- Black Book of the Admiralty. Ed. T. Twiss. R.S. 3 vols. London, 1871-6.
- Black, R. History of France related for the rising Generation. A translation of Guizot. 3 vols. London, 1872-3.
- Black, W. H. (1808-1872). Catalogue of the Ashmolean Manuscripts. Oxford, 1845.
- Catalogue of the Arundel Manuscripts in the Library of the College of Arms. London, 1829.
- Blackie, C. M. Reginald Pecock. In Eng. Hist. Rev. vol. xxvi. London, 1911.
- Blackstone, W. Commentaries on the Laws of England. 4 vols. Oxford, 1768-9.
- Blades, W. The Life and Typography of William Caxton. 2 vols. London, 1861-3.
- Blakeway, J. B. The Sheriffs of Shropshire. Shrewsbury, 1831.
- Blanc, C. and Muntz, P. Histoire des Peintres de toutes les Écoles. École Florentine. Paris, 1876.
- Blancard, G. Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Bouches-du-Rhône. Paris, 1865.
- Blancas, G. (d. 1590). Ad Regum Aragonum veterumque Comitum depictas Effigies in regia Caesaraugustanensi deputationis Aula positas Inscriptiones. Saragossa, 1587.
- Aragonensium Rerum Commentarii. Saragossa, 1588.
- Blanchard, R. Lettres et Mandements de Jean V Duc de Bretagne. In Archives de Bretagne. 5 vols. Nantes, 1889.
- St Vincent Ferrier, Durée de son Apostolat en Bretagne. In Revue de Bretagne et de Vendée, vol. xxxi. St Brieuc, 1887.
- Bled, O. Registres des Évêques de Théroutanne. 2 vols. St Omer, 1904-7.
- Blomefield, F. An Essay towards a Topographical History of the County of Norfolk. 11 vols. London, 1805-10.
- Blondel, R. (c. 1390-c. 1461). Œuvres. Ed. A. Héron. 2 vols. Rouen, 1891.
- Reductio Normanniæ. In Narratives of the Expulsion of the English from Normandy. Ed. J. Stevenson. R.S. London, 1863.
- Bloom, H. English Seals. London, 1905.
- Blore, E. Monumental Remains. London, 1726.
- Blount, T. (1618-1679). Law Dictionary. London, 1717.
- Boase, C. W. Register of the Rectors and Fellows of Exeter College, Oxford. 2 vols. Oxford, 1879-94.
- Bodin, J. F. (1776-1829). Recherches historiques sur la ville de Saumur. 2 vols. Saumur, 1845-6.
- Recherches historiques sur la ville d'Angers. Saumur, 1846.
- Recherches historiques sur l'Anjou. 2 vols. Angers, 1847.
- Bofarull y Mascaró, P. de. Los Condes de Barcelona vindicados y Cronologia y Genealogia de los Reges de España. 2 vols. Barcelona, 1836.
- Generacion de Juan I de Aragon. In Memorias de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona, vol. vi. Barcelona, 1898.

458 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Boileau, E. (c. 1257). *Livre des Métiers*. Ed. G. P. Dophing. Coll. de Documents inédits. Paris, 1837. Ed. R. Lespinasse and F. Bonnardot. In *Histoire Générale de Paris*. Paris, 1879.
- Bonal, A. (1548-1628). *Comté et Comtes de Rodez*. Rodez, 1885.
- Bonaparte, L. N. (1808-1873). *Étude sur le Passé et l'Avenir de l'Artillerie*. 6 vols. Paris, 1846-71.
- Bond, F. Westminster Abbey. London, 1909.
- *Visitors' Guide to Westminster Abbey*. London, 1909.
- Bond, J. J. *Handy Book of Rules and Tables*. London, 1875.
- [Bonis.] *Les Livres et Comptes des Frères Bonis, Marchands (1345-1368)*. Ed. E. Forestie. 2 vols. Paris, 1890-4.
- Bonnardot, A. *Les Rues et Églises de Paris vers 1500*. Paris, 1876.
- *Dissertations archéologiques sur les anciennes enceintes de Paris*. Paris, 1852.
- *Études archéologiques sur les anciens Plans de Paris des XVI, XVII et XVIII siècles*. Paris, 1851.
- *Iconographie de vieux Paris*. In *Revue Universelle des Arts*. Brussels, 1856.
- Bonnechose, F. P. (b. 1801). *Les Réformateurs avant la Réforme*. 2 vols. Paris, 1844.
- Bonney, H. R. (1780-1862). *Historic Notices of Fotheringhay*. Oundle, 1821.
- Book of the Army Pageant*. London, 1910.
- Bordeaux, J. H. R. and others. *La Normandie Illustrée*. 2 vols. Nantes, 1852.
- Bordier, H. R. and Charton, E. *Histoire de France*. 2 vols. Paris, 1859, 1860.
- Borély, A. E. *Histoire de la Ville du Havre*. 3 vols. Le Havre, 1880-1.
- Borrelli de Serres, L. L. *Recherches sur divers Services Publics du XIII^e au XVII^e siècle*. 3 vols. Paris, 1895-1909.
- Borsa, M. *Pier Candido Decembri e l'Umanesimo in Lombardia*. In *Archivio Storico Lombardo*, ser. 11, vol. x, anno xx. Milan, 1893.
- *Correspondence of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and Pier Candido Decembri*. In *Eng. Hist. Rev.* vol. xix. London, 1904.
- Bossard, E. *Gilles de Rais*. Paris, 1886.
- Bosworth, J. (1789-1876). *Compendious Anglo-Saxon and English dictionary*. London, 1848.
- *Anglo-Saxon dictionary . . . enlarged by T. N. Toller*. Oxford, 1882-98.
- Bouchard (or Bouchart), A. *Les Grandes Chroniques de Bretagne*. Ed. H. de Meignen. Nantes, 1886.
- Bouche, H. (1598-1671). *La Chorographie ou Description de Provence*. 2 vols. Aix, 1664.
- Bouchet, J. (1476-1550). *Les Annales d'Aquitaine*. Poitiers, 1644.
- *Le Panégyrique du Seigneur Loys de la Trimoille*. In *Panthéon Littéraire*. Paris, 1836.
- Bouchot, H. *La Franche Comté*. Paris, 1890.
- *La Famille d'Autrefois*. Paris, 1887.
- *Les Primitifs français*. Paris, 1904.
- *Le Portrait de Louis II d'Anjou Roi de Sicile*. In *Gazette Archéologique*, année xi. Paris, 1886.
- Boudet, M. *Registres Consulaires de St Flour (1376-1405)*. Paris, 1898.
- Boudet, M. and Grand, R. *Étude historique sur les Épidémies de Peste en Haute Auvergne*. Paris, 1902.
- Bouillons, *Livre de*. Archives municipales de Bordeaux, vol. i. Bordeaux, 1867.
- Boulay, C. E. du (or Bulaeus). *Historia Universitatis Parisiensis*. 6 vols. Paris, 1665-73.

- Boulé, A. *Le Chevalier Helyon, sire de Jacquville*. Fontainebleau, 1893.
- *Jean sans Peur et Jeanne D'Arc*. 2 vols. Paris, 1900.
- Boullé, J. *Recherches historiques sur la Maison de Saint Lazare à Paris*. In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. iii. Paris, 1877.
- Boulliot, J. B. J. *Biographie Ardennaise*. 2 vols. Paris, 1830.
- Bouquet, F. *Jeanne D'Arc au Château de Rouen*. In *Revue de Normandie*, vols. v, vi. Rouen, 1865-6.
- *Notice historique et archéologique sur le Donjon du Château de Philippe Auguste bâti à Rouen en 1205*. Rouen, 1877.
- *Documents concernant l'Histoire de Neufchâtel-en-Bray*. 2 vols. Rouen, 1884-5.
- Bouquet, Th. *Alain Blanchart*. In *Revue des Sociétés savantes*, vol. v. Paris, 1858.
- Bourassé, J. J. *Les Cathédrales de France*. Tours, 1845.
- *Les Châteaux historiques de France*. Tours, 1876.
- Bourdeilles, Pierre de, lord of Brantôme. *Les sept discours touchant les galantes*. Ed. H. Bouchot. 3 vols. Paris, 1882.
- *Œuvres complètes*. Ed. J. A. C. Bouchon. 2 vols. Paris, 1838.
- Bourdigné, J. (d. 1547). *Chroniques d'Anjou*. 2 vols. Angers, 1842.
- Bourgeois de Paris, *Journal d'un*. Ed. A. Tuetey. Paris, 1881. Also in *Nouvelle Collection* (Michaud and Poujoulat), ser. 1, vol. ii.
- Bourget, J. (1724-1776). *History of the Royal Abbey of Bec*. London, 1779.
- Re-translated into French by V. E. Pillet. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xii. Caen, 1841.
- Bournon, F. Paris. *Histoire, Monuments, Administration*. Paris, 1888.
- *Histoire de la Ville et du Canton de St Denis*. Paris, 1892.
- *L'Hôtel Royal de St Pol*. In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. vi. Paris, 1879.
- *La Bastille*. Paris, 1893.
- Bourquetot, F. (1815-1868). *Histoire de Provins*. 2 vols. Provins, 1839-40.
- *Notice sur le Manuscrit intitulé Cartulaire de la Ville de Provins*. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. xvii. Paris, 1856.
- Bourricaud, A. *Marennes et son Arrondissement*. Marennes, 1866.
- Boutall, C. (1812-1877). *Monumental Brasses*. London, 1849.
- Boutaric, E. *Institutions Militaires de la France avant les Armées permanentes*. Paris, 1863.
- Boutiot, Th. (1816-1875). *Histoire de la Ville de Troyes et la Champagne méridionale*. 5 vols. Troyes, 1870-80.
- *Documents inédits tirés des Archives de Troyes*. 3 vols. Troyes, 1878.
- *Louis Jouvenel des Ursins, Chevalier, Bailli de Troyes*. Troyes, 1864.
- *Rapport sur les Archives municipales de la Ville de Troyes*. Troyes, 1858.
- Bouvier, Gilles Le (or Berry) (1386-c. 1457). *Histoire Chronologique du roy Charles VII*. In *Godefroy, Charles VI, and Charles VII*.
- *Armorial de France, Angleterre et autres Puissances*. Ed. Vallet de Viriville. Paris, 1866.
- *Le Recouvrement de Normandie*. In *Narratives of the Expulsion of the English from Normandy*. Ed. J. Stevenson. R.S. London, 1863.
- *Le Livre de la Description des Pays*. Ed. E. T. Hamy. Paris, 1908.
- Bowen, T. *An Historical Account of the Origin, Progress and present State of Bethlem Hospital*. London, 1783.
- *Extracts from the Records and Court Books of Bridewell Hospital*. London, 1798.

460 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Bower, W. *See* Scotichronicon.
- Boyle, R., Earl of Ossory (1621–1769). *Six Plays*. London, 1690.
- Boys, W. (1735–1803). *Collections for an History of Sandwich in Kent. Canterbury*, 1792.
- Boysset, B. (1349–after 1415). *Chronik*. In *Archiv für Litteratur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, vol. vii. Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1893.
- Bozon, N. (d. after 1320). *Contes Moralises*. Ed. L. T. Smith and P. Meyer. *Soc. des Anciens Textes français*. Paris, 1889.
- Brabner, J. H. F. *The Comprehensive Gazetteer of England and Wales*. 6 vols. London, 1894, &c.
- Brachet, A. *Pathologie mentale des Rois de France Louis XI et ses ascendants*. Paris, 1903.
- Brackenbury, H. *Ancient Cannon in Europe*. Woolwich, 1865–6.
- Bracton, Henricus de. *De legibus et consuetudinibus Angliæ Libri quinque*. Ed. T. Twiss. R.S. 6 vols. London, 1878.
- Bradley, A. G. *Owen Glyndwr*. London, 1901.
- *The Battle of Shrewsbury*. In *Macmillan's Magazine*. London, July, 1903.
- *The Romance of Northumberland*. London, 1908.
- Bradley, E. T. *Annals of Westminster Abbey*. London, 1895.
- *Popular Guide to Westminster Abbey*. London, 1885.
- Bradley, J. W. *Dictionary of Miniaturists, Illuminators, Calligraphers and Copyists*. 3 vols. London, 1887.
- Bradley, M. C. and E. T. *The Deanery Guide to Westminster Abbey*. London, 1902.
- Brampton, T. (c. 1414). *Paraphrase of the Seven Penitential Psalms*. Ed. W. H. Black. Percy Society. London, 1884.
- Brandenburg, E. *König Sigmund und Kurfürst Friedrich I von Brandenburg*. Berlin, 1891.
- Brands, J. (or Brando) (1360–1428). *Chronique (1384–1414)*. Ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove. In *Chroniques relatives à l'histoire de la Belgique sous la domination des Ducs de Bourgogne*. 2 vols. Brussels, 1870, &c.
- Brants, V. *Philippe de Maizières et son Projet de Banque Populaire*. Louvain, 1880.
- Bras, C. de Bourqueville de (1504–1593). *Les Recherches et Antiquités de la Province de Neustrie*. Caen, 1588.
- Braun, G. and Hogenberg, F. *Civitates orbis Terrarum*. 6 vols. Cologne, 1573, 1618.
- — *Théâtre des principales Villes de tout l'Univers*. 2 vols. Cologne, 1574, 1575.
- Brayley, E. W. and Britton, J. *History of the Ancient Palace and late Houses of Parliament at Westminster*. London, 1836.
- — *Beauties of England and Wales*. 19 vols. London, 1801–18.
- Bréard, C. *Le Compte du Clos des Galées de Rouen (1382–1384)*. In *Soc. de l'Hist. de Normandie, Mélanges*, vol. ii. Rouen, 1893.
- *Les Archives de la Ville de Honfleur*. Paris, 1885.
- Bree, J. *The Cursory Sketch of the State of this Kingdom during the fourteenth century*. London, 1791.
- Bréquigny, L. G. O. F. (1712–1794). *Rôles Normands et Français et autres Pièces tirées des Archives de Londres*. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xxiii. Caen, 1858.

- Brett, E. J. A pictorial and descriptive Record of the Origin and Development of Arms and Armour. London, 1894.
- Bridges, J. (1666-1724). History of Northamptonshire. 2 vols. Oxford, 1791.
- Bridgett, T. E. History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain. 2 vols. London, 1881.
- Brie, F. W. D. Geschichte und Quellen der Mittlenglischen Prosachronik, "The Brut of England" or "The Chronicles of England." Marburg, 1905.
- Brière, L. Notes pour servir à l'Histoire de l'Hôtel Dieu de Paris. Paris, 1870.
- Bright, J. F. History of England. 5 vols. London, 1887.
- [Brioc. Chron.] Chronicon Briocense. In G. A. Lobineau, Histoire de Bretagne, vol. ii.
- British Archaeological Association. Transactions. 2 vols. London, 1844.
- Britton, J. (1771-1857). Historical and Descriptive Essays accompanying a series of Engraved Specimens of the Architectural Antiquities of Normandy. London, 1828.
- History and Antiquities of the See and Cathedral Church of Winchester. London, 1817.
- The Beauties of Wiltshire. 3 vols. London, 1801-25.
- Britton, J. and Brayley, E. W. Memoirs of the Tower of London. London, 1830.
- Brockhaus, F. A. Konversations-Lexikon. 17 vols. Leipzig, 1892-7.
- Brodrick, G. C. A History of the University of Oxford. London, 1886.
- Memorials of Merton College. Oxford Historical Society. Oxford, 1885.
- Brooke, Ralph (d. 1625). Catalogue of the Succession of Kings. London, 1619.
- Brossard de Ruville. Histoire de la Ville des Andelis. 2 vols. Les Andelys, 1863, 1864.
- Brougham, H. P. England and France under the House of Lancaster. London, 1852.
- Broussillon, Bertrand de. La Maison de Laval. 4 vols. Paris, 1895-1902.
- Brown, A. M. The Leader of the Lollards. London, 1848.
- Brown, E. Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum et Fugiendarum. *See* Graes.
- Brown, J. T. T. Authorship of the King's Quair. Glasgow, 1896.
- Browne, J. Fabric Rolls and Documents of York Minster. York, 1863.
- Bruce, J. An Outline of the History of the Court of Star Chamber. In *Archæologia*, vol. xxv. London, 1834.
- Bruchet, M. Inventaire partiel du Trésor des Chartes de Chambéry à l'Époque d'Amédée VIII. Chambéry, 1900.
- Le Château de Ripaille. Paris, 1907.
- Bruel, A. Pouillés du Diocèses de Clermont et de St Flour du xiv^e au xviii^e siècles. In *Collection de Documents inédits, Mélanges Historiques*, vol. iv. Paris, 1882.
- Brushfield, T. N. The Bishoprick of Exeter, 1419-1420. In *Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science*, vol. xviii. Plymouth, 1886.
- [Brut.] The Brute or the Chronicles of England. Ed. F. W. D. Brie. E.E.T.S. 2 vols. London, 1906-8.
- Brutails, J. A. Cartulaire de l'Église Collégiale Saint Seurin de Bordeaux. Bordeaux, 1897.
- Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Gironde. Bordeaux, 1908.
- Brute, Thorpe, Cobham, &c., Writings and examinations of, with the Lantern of Light. London, 1831.

462 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Bry, G., lord of la Clergerie. *Histoire des Pays et Comté du Perche et Duché d'Alençon*. Paris, 1620.
- Bucelin, J. (1571-1626). *Annales Gallo-Flandriae*. Douai, 1624.
- Buchanan, G. (1506-1582). *Rerum Scotticarum Historia*. Edinburgh, 1582.
- Buck, S. *Antiquities and Venerable Remains of Castles, Monasteries, Palaces, &c. in England and Wales*. 3 vols. London, 1764.
- Buckler, B. *Stemmata Chicheleana*. Oxford, 1765.
- Buckley, A. B. *History of England for Beginners*. London, 1892.
- Bueil, A. (c. 1405-1477). *Le Jouvencel*. 2 vols. Paris, 1887-9.
- Bullen, A. H. *Selections from the Poems of Michael Drayton*. Chilworth, 1883.
- Bullet, J. A. (1699-1775). *Dissertation sur Melusine*. In J. M. C. Leber: *Collection des meilleurs dissertations relatifs à l'Histoire de France*, vol. xviii. Paris, 1830.
- Bulletin critique*. Paris, 1866, &c.
- Bullrich, G. *Ueber Charles d'Orléans und die ihm zugeschriebene englische Uebersetzung seiner Gedichte*. Berlin, 1893.
- Bulteau, M. T. *Monographie de la Cathédrale de Chartres*. Soc. Archéologique d'Eure-et-Loir. Chartres, 1892-1901.
- Bund, J. W. W. *Register of the Diocese of Worcester during the Vacancy of the See*. Oxford, 1897.
- Bunge, F. G. *Liv- Esth- und Curländisches Urkundenbuch*. 6 vols. Reval, 1852, &c.
- Burchett, J. *A Complete History of the most remarkable Transactions at Sea*. London, 1720.
- Burlington Magazine*, The. London, 1881, &c.
- Burnett, G. *The Red Book of Menteith reviewed*. Edinburgh, 1881.
- Burney, C. *A General History of Music*. 4 vols. London, 1782-9.
- Burrows, M. *The Cinq Ports*. London, 1889.
- *Family of Brocas of Beaurepaire*. London, 1886.
- Burton, J. (1697-1771). *Monasticon Eboracense*. York, 1788.
- Burton, J. H. *The History of Scotland*. 8 vols. Edinburgh, 1873.
- Burton, T. (d. 1437). *Chronica Monasterii de Melsa*. Ed. E. A. Bond. R.S. 3 vols. London, 1866-8.
- Burt, J. *Contract for building a Hall at Hamsey in Sussex in 1321*. *Archaeological Journal*, vol. xxiv. London, 1867.
- Burwell, J. *An Historical Account of the Knights of the Most Noble Order of the Garter*. London, 1757.
- Butler, Alban (1710-1773). *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and other principal Saints*. 2 vols. Dublin, 1833.
- Cabinet Historique*, Le. Paris, 1855, &c.
- Cadier, L. *Les États de Béarn depuis leur Origine jusqu'au commencement du xvi^e siècle*. Paris, 1888.
- Cagny, P. (1375-after 1438). *Chroniques des Ducs d'Alençon*. Ed. H. Moranvillé. Paris, 1892.
- Cahier, C. (1807-1882). *Caractéristiques des Saints dans l'Art populaire*. 2 vols. Paris, 1867.
- *Nouveaux Mélanges d'Archéologie, d'Histoire et de Littérature sur le Moyen Age*. 2 vols. Paris, 1874.
- *Le Traité d'Arras de 1414*. In *Mém. de l'Académie d'Arras*, vol. xi. Arras, 1909.

- Caillebotte. Essai sur l'histoire et les antiquités de la ville et arrondissement de Domfront. Domfront, 1827.
- Caillet, L. Étude sur les relations de la commune de Lyon avec Charles VII et Louis XI. Lyons, 1909.
- Caix de St Aymour, A. X. La Maison de Caix. Paris, 1895.
- [Cal. Dipl. Doc.] Calendar of Diplomatic Documents. In Deputy Keeper's Report, vol. xlv, App. I. London, 1885.
- [Cal. Doc. Franc.] Calendar of Documents preserved in France. Ed. J. H. Round. London, 1899.
- [Cal. Doc. Scot.] Calendar of Documents relating to Scotland preserved in the Public Record Office. J. Bain. 4 vols. London, 1881-8.
- [Cal. Pap. Lett.] *See* Papal Letters.
- [Cal. Pat.] Calendar of Patent Rolls. Richard II. 6 vols. London, 1895-1909.
- Henry IV. 4 vols. London, 1903-9.
- Henry V. 2 vols. London, 1910, 1911.
- Henry VI. 6 vols. London, 1900-11.
- [Cal. Rot. Hib.] Rotulorum Patentium et Clausorum Cancellariae Hiberniae Calendarium. Dublin, 1828.
- Calendar of State Papers (Domestic), 1603-1610. London, 1857.
- Calliat, V. Église St Eustache à Paris. Paris, 1850.
- Calmet, A. (1672-1757). Histoire de Lorraine. 6 vols. Nancy, 1745-57.
- Calthrop, D. C. English Costume. 2 vols. London, 1906.
- Cambi, G. Chronicon de rebus gestis Lucensium. In Muratori, vol. xviii. Cambridge Antiquarian Society Publications. Cambridge, 1846, &c.
- Cambridge History of English Literature. Ed. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller. 8 vols. Cambridge, 1907-12.
- Camden, W. Britannia. Ed. R. Gough. 3 vols. London, 1789.
- Campanus (or Campagni), J. A. (d. 1477). De Vita et Gestis Brachii. In Muratori, vol. xix.
- Campbell, Lord J. (1781-1861). Lives of the Lord Chancellors. 10 vols. London, 1856.
- Chief Justices of England. 3 vols. London, 1849-57.
- Camusat, N. Promptuarium Sacrarum Antiquitatum Tricasinae dioecesis. Troyes, 1610.
- Capefigue, J. B. H. R. (1801-1872). Histoire de France au Moyen Age (1223-1485). 4 vols. Paris, 1838.
- Capes, W. W. The English Church in the 14th and 15th centuries. London, 1900.
- Capgrave, J. (1393-1464). The Chronicle of England. Ed. F. C. Hingeston. R.S. London, 1858.
- Liber de illustribus Henricis. Ed. F. C. Hingeston. R.S. London, 1858.
- Carderara y Solano, V. Iconografía Española. 2 vols. Madrid, 1855-64.
- Carel, P. Histoire de la Ville de Caen depuis Philippe Auguste jusqu'à Charles IX. Paris, 1886.
- Carlier, C. (1725-1787). Histoire du Duché de Valois. 3 vols. Paris, 1764.
- Caro, J. (b. 1836). Das Bündniss von Canterbury. Gotha, 1880.
- Aus der Kanzlei Sigmunds. In Archiv für Oesterr. Geschichte, vol. lix. Vienna, 1879.
- Carpentier, J. de. Histoire de Cambrai et du Cambrésis. 2 vols. Leyden, 1664.
- Carr, W. University College. London, 1902.

464 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Carrick, J. C. Wycliffe and the Lollards. Edinburgh, 1908.
- Carrigan, W. The History and Antiquities of the Diocese of Ossory. 4 vols. Dublin, 1905.
- Carro, A. Histoire de Meaux. Meaux and Paris, 1865.
- Carte, Thos. (1686-1754). A General History of England. 4 vols. London, 1750.
- Catalogues des Rolles Gascons, Normans et François. 2 vols. London, 1743.
- Cartellieri, O. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Herzöge von Burgund. In Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Heidelberg, 1912, 1913.
- Carter, A. T. A History of English Legal Institutions. London, 1902.
- Carter, J. Specimens of the Ancient Sculpture and Painting now remaining in this kingdom. 2 vols. London, 1780-94.
- Carysfort, W., Earl of. The Pageants of Richard Beauchamp, Earl of Warwick. Roxburghe Club. Oxford, 1908.
- Cassell, J. Illustrated History of England. 10 vols. London, 1873.
- Castellane, Marquis de. Voyage au Purgatoire de St Patrice. In Mém. de la Soc. Archéologique du Midi de la France, vols. i, ii. Toulouse, 1834.
- Cat, E. Les Grandes Découvertes maritimes du troisième au seizième siècle. Paris, 1882.
- Catalogue of Additional manuscripts in the British Museum. London, 1864, &c.
- Catalogue of the Harleian manuscripts in the British Museum. 4 vols. London, 1808-12.
- Catalogue of the Lansdowne manuscripts in the British Museum. 2 parts. London, 1812-19.
- Catalogue of the manuscripts in the Cottonian Library deposited in the British Museum. London, 1802.
- Catholic Encyclopædia. 17 vols. New York, 1907, &c.
- Catholicum Anglicum. Ed. S. J. H. Herrtage. E.E.T.S. London, 1881.
- Caumont, A. (1801-1873). Journal de l'Expédition de Henry V en Normandie en 1417 et 1418. In Mém. de la Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie, vol. xii. Paris, 1841.
- Cavanilles, A. Historia de España. 5 vols. Madrid, 1860-3.
- Caxton, W. (1412-1492). The Cronycles of England. London, 1515.
- Polychronicon liber ultimus. In Blades, vol. i.
- Dialogues. Ed. H. Bradley. E.E.T.S. London, 1900.
- Book of the Fayts of Arms and of Chyvalerie, translated from Christine de Pisan. Westminster, 1489.
- The Curial. *See* Chartier, A.
- Cennini, C. (b. c. 1350). Le livre de l'Art. Tr. V. Mottez. Paris, 1911.
- Cent Ballades, Livre des. Ed. A. Le Queux de St Hilaire. Paris, 1868.
- Cerf, C. Histoire et Description de Notre Dame de Reims. 2 vols. Reims, 1861.
- Pierre Cauchon de Sommièvre. In Travaux de l'Académie Nationale de Reims, vol. ci. Reims, 1898.
- Chabeuf, H. Jean de la Huerta, Antoine de Moiturier, et le Tombeau de Jean sans Peur. In Mém. de l'Acad. des Sciences, Arts et Belles-Lettres de Dijon, ser. iv, vol. ii. Dijon, 1891.
- Dijon. Monuments et Souvenirs. Dijon, 1894.
- Dijon à travers les Ages. Dijon, 1897.

- Chalcondylas, Laonicus (c. 1450). *De origine et rebus gestis Turcorum*. Paris, 1650.
- Chalmel, J. L. *Histoire de Touraine*. 4 vols. Paris, 1828.
- Chalvet, P. V. *Poésies de Charles d'Orléans*. Grenoble, 1803.
- Chambers, E. K. *The Mediaeval Stage*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1903.
- Champeaux, A. *Le Meuble*. 2 vols. Paris, 1885.
- *Histoire de la Peinture décorative*. Paris, 1890.
- *Les relations du Duc de Berry avec l'Art Italien*. In *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, vol. xxxviii. Paris, 1888.
- Champeaux, A. and Gauchery, P. *Les Travaux de l'Art exécutés pour Jean de France Duc de Berry*. Paris, 1894.
- Champion, P. *Guillaume de Flavy, Capitaine de Compiègne*. Paris, 1906.
- *Chronique Martiniane*. Paris, 1907.
- *Vie de Charles Duc d'Orléans (1394-1465)*. Paris, 1911.
- *Document inédit sur l'Insurrection parisienne de 1413*. In *Bulletin Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, année xxxvii. Paris, 1910.
- *Le Prisonnier desconforté du Château de Loches*. Paris, 1909.
- Champollion-Figeac, A. *Lettres de Rois, Reines et autres Personnages des Cours de France et d'Angleterre*. 2 vols. Paris, 1839-47.
- *Louis et Charles, ducs d'Orléans*. Paris, 1844.
- *Les Poésies du duc Charles d'Orléans*. Paris, 1842.
- Chancellor, E. B. *History and Antiquities of Richmond, Kew, Petersham and Ham*. Richmond, 1894.
- *Historical Richmond*. London, 1885.
- Chandler, H. W. *Five Court Rolls of Great Cressingham*. London, 1885.
- *A Catalogue of Editions of Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics and of works illustrative of them printed in the 15th century*. Oxford, 1868.
- Chapotin, M. D. *A travers l'Histoire dominicaine ancienne et contemporaine*. Paris, 1903.
- *Études historiques sur la Province dominicaine de France*. Paris, 1890.
- Chappell, W. (1809-1888). *Old English Popular Music*. Ed. H. E. Woodbridge. 2 vols. London, 1893.
- Charavay, E. *Jean d'Orléans, Comte d'Angoulême*. Paris, 1876.
- Charles, R. *L'Invasion anglaise dans le Maine de 1417 à 1428*. Mamers, 1889.
- Charma, A. (1801-1869). *Partie des Dons faits par Henri V, Roi d'Angleterre lorsqu'il se fut rendu maître de la Normandie*. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xxiii. Caen, 1858.
- Charmettes, P. A. Lebrun de. *Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc*. 4 vols. Paris, 1817.
- Charnock, J. *History of Marine Architecture*. 3 vols. London, 1800, 1802.
- Charrier, G. *Les Jurades de la Ville de Bergerac (1352-1652)*. 12 vols. Bergerac, 1892-1903.
- Chartier, Alain (c. 1385-1429). *Œuvres*. Ed. A. Duchesne. Paris, 1607.
- *The Curial*. Translated by Wm. Caxton. E.E.T.S. London, 1888.
- Chartier, J. (c. 1400). *Chronique de Charles VII*. In D. Godefroy: *Histoire de Charles VII*. Paris, 1661.
- *Chronique de Charles VII*. Ed. Vallet de Viriville. 3 vols. Paris, 1858.
- Charton, E. T. *Voyageurs anciens et modernes*. 4 vols. Paris, 1854-6.
- Chastellain, G. (c. 1405-1475). *Œuvres*. Ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove. 8 vols. Brussels, 1863, &c.
- Chastellux, H. P. C. *Histoire généalogique de la Maison de Chastellux*. Auxerre, 1869.

466 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Chatel, E. Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Calvados. Paris, 1867, &c.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey, Poetical Works of. Ed. R. Bell. 4 vols. London, 1889-92.
- Complete Works of. Ed. W. W. Skeat. 6 vols. Oxford, 1894.
- Chauliac, Guy de (c. 1290-1368). La grande Chirurgie. Ed. E. Nicaise. Paris, 1890.
- Chaumeau, J. Histoire de Berry. Lyons, 1566.
- Chauncy, H. Historical Antiquities of Hertfordshire. London, 1700.
- Chenu, J. Recueil des antiquitez et privilèges de la Ville de Bourges et de plusieurs autres villes capitales du Royaume. Paris, 1621.
- Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum Galliae chronologica Historia. Paris, 1621.
- Chéruel, P. A. Histoire de Rouen pendant de l'Époque communale de 1150 à 1382. 2 vols. Rouen, 1843, 1844.
- Histoire de Rouen sous la Domination Anglaise. 2 parts. Rouen, 1840.
- Dictionnaire Historique des Institutions, Mœurs, et Coutumes de la France. 2 vols. Paris, 1899.
- Histoire du Moyen Age. Paris, *s.a.*
- Cheshire Sheaf, The. Chester, 1880, &c.
- Chevalier, A. L'Hôtel Dieu de Paris, et les Sœurs Augustines. Paris, 1901.
- Chevalier, C. U. J. Répertoire des Sources historiques du Moyen Age: Topo-Bibliographie. 2 vols. Montbéliard, 1894-1903.
- Bio-Bibliographie. 2 vols. Paris, 1905-7.
- Chifflet, J. J. Anastasis Childerici I Francorum regis sive Thesaurus Sepulchralis Tornaci Nerviorum. Antwerp, 1655.
- Child, F. J. The English and Scottish Popular Ballads. 5 vols. Boston, 1882-98.
- Choisy, F. T. Histoire de Charles VI, roi de France. Paris, 1695.
- Chorier, N. Histoire Généalogique de la Maison de Sassenage. Grenoble, 1669.
- Histoire générale de Dauphiné. 2 vols. Valence, 1869, 1878.
- Chrétien, H. Le prétendu Complot des Juifs et Lépreux en 1321. Chateauroux, 1887.
- Christine de Pisan (1364-c. 1430). Livre des faits du sage Roi Charles V. In Michaud et Poujoulat, Nouv. Coll. vols. i and ii.
- Œuvres poétiques. Ed. M. Roy. Soc. des Anciens Textes Français. 2 vols. Paris, 1886, 1891.
- Le Dit de Poissy. In Bibl. Éc. Chartes, vol. xviii. Paris, 1856.
- [Chron. Giles.] Incerti Scriptoris Chronicon. Ed. J. A. Giles. London, 1848.
- [Chron. Lond.] A Chronicle of London, 1189-1483. Ed. N. H. Nicolas. London, 1827.
- [Chron. R. II-H. VI.] A chronicle of the reigns of Richard II, Henry IV, Henry V, and Henry VI (1377-1461). Ed. J. S. Davies. Camden Soc. 1856.
- [Chron. Scr.] See Dugdale, W.
- Chronique rouennaise. Printed with Cochon, *q.v.*
- Chronographia Regum Francorum, 1279-1405. Ed. H. Moranvillé. Soc. de l'Hist. de France. 3 vols. Paris, 1891-7.
- Church, A. J. Henry V. London, 1889.
- Church Quarterly Review. London, 1875, &c.
- Cibrario, L. Storia e descrizione della R. Badia d'Altacomba. Turin, 1845.
- Cronologia dei Principi di Savoya rectificata. In Acad. delle Scienze di Torino, ser. 11, vol. i.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 467

- Circourt, A. de. *Combat naval devant La Rochelle en 1419*. In *Bull. de la Soc. des Archives Historiques de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis*, vol. ii. Paris and Saintes, 1886.
- Clamageran, J. J. *Histoire de l'Impôt en France*. 3 vols. Paris, 1867-76.
- Clark, A. Lincoln College. London, 1898.
- *Great Waltham Five Centuries Ago*. In *Essex Review*, vol. xiii. Colchester, 1904.
- *Serfdom on an Essex Manor (1308-1378)*. In *Eng. Hist. Rev.* vol. xx. London, 1905.
- Clark, G. T. *Genealogies of Morgan and Glamorgan*. London, 1886.
- *Mediaeval Military Architecture in England*. 2 vols. London, 1884.
- Clark, J. W. *Libraries in the Mediaeval and Renaissance Period*. Cambridge, 1894.
- *The Care of Books*. Cambridge, 1902.
- Clarke, C. W. B. *The true History of St George the Martyr*. Cape Town, 1900.
- Clarke, J. *Military Institutions of Vegetius*. London, 1767.
- Clay, R. M. *The Mediaeval Hospitals of England*. London, 1909.
- Clemanges, Nicolas (1360-c. 1435). *Opera omnia*. Leyden, 1613.
- Clerc, E. *Essai sur l'Histoire de la Franche Comté*. 2 vols. Besançon, 1870.
- Cleveland, Duchess of. *The Battle Abbey Rolls*. 3 vols. London, 1889.
- Clèves, P. de (1459-1527). *Instruction de toutes manières de guerroyer*. Paris, 1558.
- Clinch, G. *Bloomsbury and St Giles, Past and Present*. London, 1890.
- *English Costume*. London, 1909.
- Clouet, L. *Histoire de Verdun et du Pays Verdunois*. 3 vols. Verdun, 1867-70.
- Clowes, W. L. *The Royal Navy. A History from the earliest times to the present*. 6 vols. London, 1897-1901.
- Clutterbuck, R. *History of the County of Hertford*. 3 vols. London, 1815-27.
- Cobbett, R. S. *Memorials of Twickenham*. London, 1872.
- Cochery, A. *Dictionnaire des Postes de la République Française*. Paris, 1881.
- Cochet, J. B. D. *Les Églises de l'Arrondissement du Havre*. 2 vols. Ingouville, 1845.
- *Culture de la Vigne en Normandie*. In *Revue de Rouen*. Rouen, 1844.
- *Répertoire archéologique du département de la Seine-Inférieure*. Paris, 1871.
- Cochlæus (or Dobneck), J. (1479-1552). *Historia Hussitarum*. Mainz, 1549.
- Cochon, Pierre (c. 1390-c. 1456). *Chronique Normande*. Ed. Ch. de Robillard de Beaurepaire. Soc. de l'hist. normande. Rouen, 1870.
- Cockayne, A. E. *Cockayne Memoranda*. 2 vols. Congleton, 1869, 1873.
- Cockle, M. J. D. *Bibliography of English Military Books up till 1642*. London, 1900.
- Cohausen, A. von. *Die Befestigungsweisen der Vorzeit und des Mittelalters*. Ed. M. Jähns. With an atlas. Wiesbaden, 1898.
- Coke, J. *The Debate between the Heralds of England and France*. London, 1550.
- Cole, J. *History and Antiquities of Higham Ferrers*. Wellingborough, 1838.
- Collas, E. *Valentine de Milan, Duchesse d'Orléans*. Paris, 1911.
- Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*. Ed. F. Madden, J. G. Nichols and others. 8 vols. London, 1834-43.
- Collection of Remarkable Events relative to the City of New Sarum, from 1356 to 1783*. Salisbury, 1817.

468 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Collier, Jeremy (1650-1726). *Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain*. 9 vols. London, 1852.
- Collins, A. (1682-1760). *The Peerage of England*. 9 vols. London, 1779.
- Collins, J. C. *Jonathan Swift*. London, 1893.
- Collinson, J. (1757-1793). *History and Antiquities of the County of Somerset*. 3 vols. Bath, 1791.
- Colonna, Gilles de. *See* Aegidius Romanus.
- Comba, E. *Histoire de Vaudois*. London, 1901.
- Combrouse, G. (1808-1873). *Catalogue raisonné des Monnaies Nationales de France*. 2 vols. Paris, 1839-44.
- Comines, P. (1445-1509). *Mémoires*. Ed. L. M. E. Dupont. 3 vols. Paris, 1840-7.
- Ed. B. le Mandrot. 2 vols. Paris, 1901.
- Comité des Travaux historiques et des Sociétés savantes. *Bulletin*. Paris, 1883, &c.
- Compayré, C. *Études historiques et Documents inédits sur l'Albigeois, le Castrais, et l'ancien Diocèse de Lavaur. Albi, 1841.*
- [Conc.] *Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae*. Ed. D. Wilkins. 4 vols. London, 1737.
- Coningsby, T. (d. 1625). *Journal of the Siege of Rouen, 1591*. In *Camden Miscellany*, vol. i. London, 1847.
- Continuation of the Croyland Chronicle*. In T. Gale, *Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores*, vol. i.
- Conybeare. *See* Page, J.
- Cook, T. A. *The Story of Rouen*. London, 1899.
- Cookry, *Noble Boke off* (c. 1467). Ed. R. Napier. London, 1882.
- Cooper, C. P. *Report on Foedera. Appendices*. 7 parts. London, 1869.
- Cooper, W. D. *Sussex Men at Agincourt*. In *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, vol. xv. Lewes, 1863.
- *The Families of Chesworth and Hoo*. *Ibid.* vol. viii. London, 1856.
- Copinger, W. A. *Heraldry simplified*. Manchester, 1910.
- Coquille, G. de (1523-1603). *Histoire du Pays et Duché de Nivernois*. Paris, 1612.
- Cordeliers, *Chronique des* (1400-1422). In Monstrelet, ed. Douët d'Arcq, vol. vi.
- Corrad de Breban, A. *Les Rues de Troyes*. Troyes, 1857.
- Corrozet, G. *Les divers Propos mémorables des nobles et illustres Hommes de la Chrestienté*. Paris, 1557.
- Cosneau, E. *Le Connétable de Richemont*. Paris, 1886.
- *Les Grands Traités de la Guerre de Cent Ans*. Paris, 1889.
- Costa de Beauregard, H. J. *Mémoires historiques sur la Maison Royale de Savoie* (vol. iv ed. by C. A. Costa de Beauregard). 4 vols. Turin, 1816, 1888.
- Costa de Beauregard, L. *Souvenirs du Règne d'Amédée VIII, premier Duc de Savoie*. Chambéry, 1859.
- Cotgrave, R. *A dictionarie of the French and English tongues*. London, 1611.
- Cothi, Lewis Glyn. *Poetical Works*. Cymmrodorion Society. Oxford, 1837.
- Cotman, J. S. *Engravings of Sepulchral Brasses in Norfolk and Suffolk*. 2 vols. London, 1838.
- Cotman, J. S. and Turner, D. *Architectural Antiquities of Normandy*. 2 vols. London, 1822.
- Cotton, H. *Fasti Ecclesiae Hiberniae*. 4 vols. Dublin, 1851.
- Cotton, Sir R. B. *Abridgement of Records*. London, 1657.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 469

- Cotton, W. An Elizabethan Guild of the City of Exeter. Exeter, 1873.
Cotton, W. and Dallas, J. Notes and Gleanings. 5 vols. Exeter, 1888-92.
Cotton MS. Galba B i. *See* Gilliodts van Severen.
Couderc, C. Livre de la Chasse, par Gaston Phébus Comte de Foix. Réproduction de 87 miniatures. Paris, 1909.
— Album de Portraits d'après les Collections du Département des Manuscrits. Paris, 1909.
Courtalon-Delaistre, J. C. Topographie historique de la Ville et du Diocèse de Troyes. 3 vols. Troyes, 1783-4.
Courteault, H. Un Archiviste des Comtes de Foix au xv^e siècle. In Annales du Midi. Toulouse, 1894.
— Gaston IV, Comte de Foix (1423-1472). Toulouse, 1895.
— Les Archives d'Aragon et Navarre au xv^e siècle. In Revue des Bibliothèques, vol. i. Paris, 1891.
Courtenay, T. P. Commentaries on the Historical Plays of Shakespeare. 2 vols. London, 1840.
Courtépée, C. Description historique et topographique du Duché de Bourgogne. 7 vols. Dijon, 1774-85.
Cousinot, Guillaume (d. after 1442). Les Gestes des nobles François. In Chronique de la Pucelle. Ed. Vallet de Viriville. Paris, 1859.
Coussemaker, F. de. Thierry Gherbode, secrétaire et conseiller des Ducs de Bourgogne Philippe le Hardi et Jean sans Peur. Lille, 1902.
[Cov. Leet.] The Coventry Leet Book. Ed. M. D. Harris. E.E.T.S. 4 vols. London, 1907-13.
Coville, A. Les Cabochiens. Paris, 1888.
— L'Ordonnance Cabochienne. Paris, 1891.
— Recherches sur la Misère en Normandie. In Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Caen, année ii. Caen, 1886.
— Les États de Normandie, leurs Origines et leur Développement au xiv^e siècle. Paris, 1894.
— Les premiers Valois et la Guerre de Cent Ans. In Lavis, Histoire de France, vol. iv. Paris, 1902.
— Le Véritable Texte de la Justification du Duc de Bourgogne par Jean Petit. In Bibl. Éc. Chartes, vol. lxxii. Paris, 1911.
Cowan, L. The Royal House of Stuart. 2 vols. London, 1908.
Cowell, J. (1554-1611). Law Dictionary. London, 1727.
Cox, G. W. The Crusades. London, 1894.
Cox, J. C. The Royal Forests of England. London, 1905.
— Notes on the Churches of Derbyshire. 4 vols. Chesterfield, 1875-9.
Cox, R. Hibernia Anglicana. 2 vols. London, 1689.
Coxe, H. O. (1811-1881). Catalogi Codicum MSS. Bibliothecae Bodleianae. 14 vols. Oxford, 1853-1909.
— Catalogus Codicum MSS. qui in collegiis aulisque Oxoniensibus hodie adservantur. 2 parts. Oxford, 1852.
Coxe, W. Historical Tour in Monmouthshire. London, 1801.
Coyecque, E. L'Hôtel Dieu de Paris au Moyen Age. 2 vols. Paris, 1889-91.
Craik, G. L. and Macfarlane, C. The Pictorial History of England. 4 vols. London, 1856.
Craik, H. The Life of Jonathan Swift. 2 vols. London, 1894.
Creeny, W. F. A Book of Facsimiles of Monumental Brasses of the Continent of Europe. Norwich, 1884.

470 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Creighton, M. Some Literary Correspondence of Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. In Eng. Hist. Rev. vol. x. London, 1895.
 — The Early Renaissance in England. Cambridge, 1895.
 — Historical Essays and Reviews. London, 1902.
 Crespin, J. Actes des Martyrs. Geneva, 1564.
 Crevier, J. B. Histoire de l'Université de Paris. 7 vols. Paris, 1761.
 Crisp, R. Richmond and its inhabitants from the Olden Time. London, 1866.
 Cristofori, F. Storia dei Cardinali. Rome, 1888.
 Cronin, H. S. The Twelve Conclusions of the Lollards. In Eng. Hist. Rev. vol. xxii. London, 1907.
 Crosthwaite, J. F. Brief Memoir of Major-General Sir John George Woodford. Keswick, 1881.
 Crowe, E. E. The History of France. 5 vols. London, 1858-68.
 Crowe, J. A. (1825-1896) and Cavalcaselle, G. B. History of Painting in Italy from the Second to the Sixteenth Century. 6 vols. London, 1903.
 — The Early Flemish Painters. London, 1872.
 Crowned King. In Piers Plowman, part iii. E.E.T.S. London, 1873.
 [Croyl. Hist.] Historiae Croylandensis Continuatio. In T. Gale, Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores, vol. i.
 Cuissard, C. Étude sur le Commerce et l'Industrie à Orléans avant 1789. In Mém. de la Soc. d'Agriculture, Belles-Lettres, et Art d'Orléans, vol. xxxv. Orléans, 1897.
 Cunningham, P. Handbook of London Past and Present. London, 1850.
 Curial. *See* Chartier, A.
 Curmer, H. L. *See* Imitatio Christi.
 Cussans, J. E. History of Hertfordshire. 3 vols. London, 1870-3.
 — Handbook of Heraldry. London, 1869.
 Cust, L. Catalogue illustrative of Early English Portraiture—Loan Collection, Burlington Fine Arts Club. London, 1909.
 Czephan, R. Die Schlacht bei Crécy. Berlin, 1906.
 [D.K.R. or Dep. Keepers' Rept.] Annual Reports of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records. London, 1840, &c.
 Dacher, G. (d. 1471). Constanzer Chronik. 1464.
 D'Achery, J. L. (1609-1685). Veterum aliquot scriptorum Spicilegium. 13 vols. Paris, 1664, &c.
 Daire, L. F. Histoire de la Ville d'Amiens. 2 vols. Paris, 1757.
 Dale, L. The Principles of English Constitutional History. London, 1902.
 Dallaway, J. History of West Sussex. 2 vols. London, 1815-30.
 D'Alton, J. History of the County of Dublin. Dublin, 1838.
 — Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin. Dublin, 1838.
 Daniel, Gabriel. Histoire de France. 3 vols. Paris, 1713.
 — Histoire de la Milice française. 2 vols. Paris, 1721.
 Daniel, Geo. (1616-1657). Poems. Ed. A. B. Grosart. 4 vols. Boston, Lincs. 1878.
 Danvin, B. Vicissitudes, Heur et Malheur du Vieil Hesdin. St Pol, 1866.
 Daris, J. Histoire du Diocèse et de la Principauté de Liège pendant le xv^e siècle. Liège, 1887.
 Darmesteter, A. M. J. Marguerites du Temps Passé. Paris, 1892. Translated as "A Mediaeval Garland" by M. Tomlinson. London, 1898.
 Darne, Macé. *See* Joubert.
 Dart, J. (c. 1723). Westmonasterium. 2 vols. London, *s.a.*

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 471

- Dasent, A. I. *The Speakers of the House of Commons*. London, 1911.
- Daumet, G. *Calais sous la Domination Anglaise*. Paris, 1893.
- *Étude sur l'Alliance de la France et de la Castille au xiv^e et au xv^e siècles*. Paris, 1898.
- Daussy, H. *La Ligne de la Somme pendant la Campagne 1870-1871*. Paris, 1875.
- Davenport, C. J. *The English Regalia*. London, 1897.
- Davey, R. B. *The Pageant of London*. London, 1906.
- Davies, C. M. *History of Holland*. 3 vols. London, 1841.
- Davies, J. S. *History of Southampton*. Southampton, 1883.
- Davies, R. *Extracts from the Municipal Records of the city of York*. London, 1843.
- Dearmer, P. *Highways and Byways in Normandy*. London, 1900.
- Debate. *See* Coke.
- Découverte des Corps des Ducs de Bourgogne, Philippe le Hardi et Jean sans Peur. In *Mém. de la Commission des Antiquités du Département de la Côte d'Or*, vol. i. Dijon, 1841.
- Defeyre, G. *Les Ducs de Bourbon*. Paris, 1897.
- Deguileville (i.e. Digulleville), G. (b. c. 1295, d. c. 1360). *Le Pèlerinage de l'Ame*. Ed. J. J. Stürzinger. Roxburghe Club. London, 1895.
- Dehaisnes, C. *Histoire de l'Art dans la Flandre, l'Artois et le Hainault avant le xv^e siècle*. Lille, 1886.
- Dehaisnes-Finot, J. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Nord*. Ser. B. 3 vols. Lille, 1865, 1899, 1906.
- Delachenal, R. *Histoire de Charles V*. 3 vols. Paris, 1909-16.
- *Chroniques des Règnes de Jean II et de Charles V*. 2 vols. Paris, 1910.
- Delarbre, A. *Notice sur l'ancien Royaume des Auvergnats et sur la Ville de Clermont*. Clermont, 1805.
- Delarue, G. *Essais historiques sur la Ville de Caen et son Arrondissement*. 2 vols. Caen, 1820.
- *Nouveaux Essais historiques sur la Ville de Caen*. 2 vols. Caen, 1842.
- Delaunay, D. *Étude sur Alain Chartier*. Paris, 1876.
- Delaville le Roulx, J. *Registres des Comptes Municipaux de la Ville de Tours*. 2 vols. Tours, 1878-81.
- *La Domination Bourguignonne à Tours*. In *Cabinet Historique*, ser. 11, vol. i. Paris, 1877.
- Delbrück, H. *Geschichte der Kriegskunst*. Berlin, 1900, &c.
- Delehaye, H. *Le Pèlerinage de Laurent de Pasztho au Purgatoire de St Patrice*. In *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. xxvii. Brussels, 1908.
- Delisle, L. V. *Histoire du Château et des Sires de St Sauveur-le-Vicomte*. Valognes, 1867.
- *Études sur la Condition de la Classe Agricole et de l'État de l'Agriculture en Normandie au Moyen Age*. Paris, 1851.
- *Mémoires sur les Baillis du Cotentin*. Caen, 1851. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xix. Caen, 1851.
- *Les Heures de Jacqueline de Bavière*. In *Bibl. Éc. Chart.* vol. xlv. Paris, 1903.
- *Fragments de l'Histoire de Gonesse*. Paris, 1859.
- *Review of P. Margry: Conquête des Iles Canaries*. In *Journal des Savants*, Nov. 1896.
- *Recherches sur la Librairie de Charles V*. 2 vols. Paris, 1907.

472 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Delisle, L. V. Fac-similé de Livres copiés et enluminés pour le Roi Charles V. Paris, 1903.
- Le Cabinet des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale. 4 vols. Paris, 1868-81.
- Delpit, J. Collection générale des Documents français qui se trouvent en Angleterre. Paris, 1847.
- Demay, G. Inventaire des Sceaux de la Collection Clairambault. In Collection de Documents inédits. 2 vols. Paris, 1885-6.
- Le Costume au Moyen Age d'après les Sceaux. Paris, 1880.
- Le Costume de Guerre et d'Apparat d'après les Sceaux du Moyen Age. Paris, 1875.
- Demogeot, J. Histoire de la Littérature Française. Paris, 1857.
- Demotier, C. E. Annales de Calais. Calais, 1856.
- Denifle, H. La Désolation des Églises, Monastères, et Hôpitaux en France pendant la guerre de cent ans. 2 vols. in 3. Paris, 1897-9.
- Denifle, H., and Chatelain, E. Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis. 2 vols. Paris, 1890-1.
- Auctarium Chartularii Universitatis Parisiensis. 2 vols. Paris, 1894-7.
- Denis, F. (1798-1890). Histoire de l'Ornementation de Manuscrit. In *Imitatio Christi*, 7.v. App.
- Denis, M. (1729-1800). Codices Manuscripti Bibliothecae Vindobonensis. 3 vols. Vienna, 1793-1802.
- Denis, Piramus (12th cent.). La vie saint Edmund le rei. Ed. F. L. Ravenel. Philadelphia, 1906.
- Desaivre, L. Le Mythe de la Mère Lusine. In *Mém. de la Soc. de Statistique des Deux Sèvres*, ser. 11, vol. xx. Niort, 1882.
- Notes sur Melusine. In *Bulletin de la Soc. des Antiquaires de l'Ouest*, ser. 11, vol. xx. Poitiers, 1899.
- Deschamps (or Morel), Eustache (b. c. 1340). Œuvres complètes. Ed. A. Le Queux de St Hilaire and G. Raynaud. 11 vols. Paris, 1878-1903.
- Deseille, E. Boulogne en 1415. In *Mém. de la Soc. Académique de l'Arrondissement de Boulogne-sur-Mer*, vol. ix. Boulogne, 1879.
- Inventaire sommaire des Archives de la Ville de Boulogne-sur-Mer. Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1884.
- Desjardins, A. États Généraux (1355-1614). Paris, 1871.
- Des Méloizes, A. Vitraux peints de la Cathédrale de Bourges. Paris, 1891-7.
- Desrués, F. Description contenant toutes les Singularitez des plus celebres Villes et Places remarquables du Royaume de France. Rouen, 1624.
- Dessalles, L. Histoire du Périgord. 3 vols. Libourne, 1886.
- Dessalles, L. and Chabaille, P. Mystère de St Crespin et St Crispinian. Paris, 1836.
- Devienne, C. J. B. d'Agneaux (1728-1792). Histoire de la Ville de Bordeaux. Paris, 1862.
- Histoire de l'Église de Bordeaux. Ed. V. Lacaze. Bordeaux, 1862.
- Histoire d'Artois. 5 vols. (s.l.), 1784-7.
- Deville, J. A. (1789-1875). Cartulaire de l'Abbaye de la Sainte Trinité du Mont de Rouen. Paris, 1840.
- Comptes de Dépenses de la Construction du Château de Gaillon. Paris, 1850. With Atlas. Paris, 1851.
- Revue des Architectes de la Cathédrale de Rouen. Rouen, 1848.
- Histoire du Château et des Sires de Tancarville. Rouen, 1834.
- Histoire du Château d'Arques. Rouen, 1839.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 473

- Devon, F. Issues of the Exchequer, Henry III to Henry VI. London, 1837.
Devon Notes and Queries. Exeter, 1903.
Devonshire Association. Transactions. Plymouth, 1874, &c.
Dewicke, E. S. The Coronation Book of Charles V of France. Henry Bradshaw Society. London, 1899.
De Witt, H. Les Chroniques de Froissart. Paris, 1881.
Dibdin, T. F. The Biographical Decameron or Ten Days Pleasant Discourse upon Illuminated Manuscripts. 3 vols. London, 1817.
— Tour in France and Germany. 3 vols. London, 1821.
Dick, W. R. A Short Sketch of the Beauchamp Tower. London, 1850.
— Inscriptions and Devices in the Beauchamp Tower. London, 1853.
[Dict. Nat. Biog.] Dictionary of National Biography. London, 1885, &c.
Didron, A. N. Vandalisme dans les Travaux d'Art. In Annales Archéologiques, vol. vii. Paris, 1847.
Dieudonné, A. La Monnaie Royale depuis la réforme de Charles V jusqu'à la restauration par Charles VII. Bibl. Éc. Chartes, vols. lxxii, lxxiii. Paris, 1911-12.
Dieve (or Divaeus), P. van (1535-1581). Rerum Brabanticarum Libri xix. Antwerp, 1610.
— Opera Varia. Louvain, 1757.
Dillon, H. A. Calais and the Pale. In Archaeologia, vol. liii. London, 1892.
— The Besague or Moton. In Archaeological Journal, vol. lxiv. London, 1907.
Dillon, H. A. and Hope, W. H. St John. Inventory of the Goods belonging to Thomas Duke of Gloucester. London, 1897.
Dinaux, A. M. (1793-1864). Trouvères, Jongleurs, et Ménestrels du Nord de la France et du Midi de la Belgique. 3 vols. Paris, 1837-43.
Diss, W. (d. 1405). Carmen de Schismate Ecclesiae. In Clemanges, Opera.
Dixon, W. H. (1821-1879). Her Majesty's Tower. Ed. W. J. Loftie. 2 vols. London, 1901.
Długosz, J. (1415-1480). Historiæ Polonicae libri xiii. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1711-12.
Dobeneck, F. L. F. Des deutschen Mittelalters Volksglauben und Heroensagen. Berlin, 1815.
Dobie, R. History of the United Parishes of St Giles'-in-the-Fields and St George's, Bloomsbury. London, 1834.
Dodu, G. La Folie de Charles VI. In Rev. Historique, vol. cl. Paris, 1925.
Doglioni (or Doleonus), G. N. (1558-1625). Del Theatro Universale de' Principi et di tutte l'Historie del Mondo. 2 vols. Venice, 1606.
Dognon, P. Les Armagnacs et les Bourguignons en Languedoc (1416-1420). In Annales du Midi, vol. i. Toulouse, 1889.
— Les Institutions politiques et Administratives du Pays de Languedoc. Toulouse, 1895.
— Quomodo Tres status Linguae Occitanae ineunte quinto decimo saeculo inter se convenire assueverint. Toulouse, 1896.
Doniol, H. La Basse-Auvergne. Paris, 1900.
Doucet, R. Les Finances Anglaises en France à la Fin de la Guerre de Cent Ans. In Le Moyen Age, ser. 11, vol. xxvii. Paris, 1926.
Douët d'Arcq, L. Choix de Pièces Inédits relatives au règne de Charles VI. 2 vols. Soc. de l'Hist. de France. Paris, 1863-4.
— Comptes de l'Hôtel des rois de France, aux xiv^e et xv^e siècles. Soc. de l'Hist. de France. Paris, 1865.

474 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Douët d'Arcq, L. Des Frais d'Enterrement dans Paris au xiv^e siècle. In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. iv. Paris, 1878.
- Comptes de l'Argenterie des Rois de France au xiv^e siècle. *Soc. de l'Hist. de France*. Paris, 1851.
- Documents inédits sur l'Assassinat de Louis duc d'Orléans. In *Annuaire Bulletin de la Soc. de l'Histoire de France*. Paris, 1864.
- Collection de Sceaux. 3 vols. Paris, 1863.
- Douglas, R. *Peerage of Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1764.
- *Baronage of Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1798.
- Douglas Book, The. Ed. W. Fraser. 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1885.
- Dowden, J. *Chartulary of the Abbey of Lindores (1195-1479)*. Edinburgh, 1903.
- Doyen, C. L. *Histoire de la ville de Beauvais depuis le 14^e siècle*. 2 vols. Beauvais, 1842.
- Doyle, J. E. *Official Baronage of England*. 3 vols. London, 1886.
- Drake, F. *History of the city of York*. London, 1736.
- Drayton, M. (1563-1631). *The First Part of the true and honourable History of Sir John Oldcastle*. In *Ancient British Drama*, vol. i. London, 1810.
- *The Ballad of Agincourt*. In *Nicolas, Agincourt*.
- Dreux du Radier, J. F. *Mémoires historiques, critiques et Anecdotes des Reines et Régentes de France*. 6 vols. Paris, 1808.
- Drouyn, L. *Bordeaux vers 1450*. Bordeaux, 1874.
- *La Guienne Militaire. Histoire des villes fortifiées, forteresses et châteaux pendant la domination Anglaise*. 2 vols. Bordeaux, 1865.
- Druitt, H. *A Manual of Costume as illustrated by Monumental Brasses*. London, 1906.
- Duarte, king of Portugal (1392-1438). *O Leal Conselheiro*. Ed. J. L. Roquete. Paris, 1842.
- Dublin Review, The. London, 1836, &c.
- Dublin St Mary's Abbey, *Chartularies of*. Ed. J. T. Gilbert. R.S. 2 vols. London, 1884.
- Du Bois, L. F. *Vaux de Vire d'Olivier Basselin*. Caen, 1821.
- Du Boulay. *See* Boulay.
- Du Cange, C. du Fresne. *Glossarium ad Scriptores mediae et infimae Latinitatis*. 6 vols. Paris, 1733.
- Ducarel, A. C. *Anglo-Norman Antiquities considered in a Tour through Part of Normandy*. London, 1767.
- *A Series of about 200 Anglo-Gallic or Norman and Aquitain Coins of the ancient Kings of England*. London, 1757.
- *The History of the Royal Hospital and Collegiate Church of St Katharine*. In *J. Nichols, Bibliotheca Topographica Britannica*, vol. ii.
- Duchesne, A. (1584-1640). *Histoire d'Angleterre*. Paris, 1614.
- *Histoire généalogique de la Maison de Dreux et de quelques autres familles*. Paris, 1631.
- *Les Antiquitez et Recherches des Villes, Chasteaux et places plus remarquables de toute la France*. 2 parts. Paris, 1609.
- *Historiae Normannorum Scriptores antiqui*. Paris, 1619.
- Duchesne, F. *Histoire des Chanceliers et Gardes des Sceaux*. Paris, 1680.
- Duchet, Th. and Giry, A. *Cartulaire de l'Église de Téroouanne*. St Omer, 1881.
- Duck, A. (1580-1649). *Vita Henrici Chichele*. Oxford, 1617. Translated as "Life of Archbishop Chichele." London, 1699.

- Duckett, G. F. Charters and Records of Cluni. 2 vols. London, 1888.
— Visitations of the order of Cluni. London, 1893.
— Remarks on a Battle Abbey Roll of the 15th Century from the Collections of William of Worcester. In *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, vol. xxviii. London, 1878.
- Duclaux, Agnes M. F. The Fields of France. London, 1903.
- Ducom, A. La Commune d'Agen. Paris, 1892.
- Dufour, V. Le Chancelier Poète. In *Le Bibliophile Français*, vol. vii. Paris, 1873.
— Une Famille de Peintres parisiens aux xiv^e et xv^e siècles. Paris, 1877.
- Dugdale, W. (1605–1686). A Perfect Copy of all Summons of the Nobility to the great Councils and Parliaments of this Realm. London, 1685.
— The Baronage of England. 2 vols. London, 1675.
— Origines Juridiciales. London, 1671.
— Antiquities of Warwickshire. Ed. W. Thomas. 2 vols. London, 1730.
— Monasticon Anglicanum. Ed. J. Caley, H. Ellis, and B. Bandinel. 6 vols. in 8. London, 1817–30.
- Dulaure, J. A. Nouvelle Description des Environs de Paris. Paris, 1786.
— Descriptions des principaux Lieux de la France. 5 vols. Paris, 1789.
- Dulcken, H. W. Illustrated History of England. London, 1888.
- Dumas, A. Le Siège de Rouen. In *Revue de Rouen*, vol. i.
- Dumont, E. L'Abbaye de Montivilliers. Havre, 1876.
- Dumont, J. (1662–1726). Corps Universel Diplomatique. 8 vols. (each in two parts). Amsterdam, 1726–31.
- Dumontet, J. Fouilles des Caves du Palais du Duc Jean de Berry. In *Mém. du Comité des Travaux historiques et des Sociétés savantes*. Paris, 1863.
- Duncombe, J. (1729–1786). History and Antiquities of the three archiepiscopal hospitals at and near Canterbury. In J. Nichols, *Bibl. Top. Brit.* vol. i.
- Duncumb, J. History of the County of Hereford. 2 vols. London, 1884.
- Dunois, Registres et Minutes du Comté de. Ed. L. Merlet. Chartres, 1886.
- Dupin, L. Ellies (1657–1719). History of the Church. 4 vols. London, 1716.
- Dupleix, Scipion. Histoire Générale de France. 3 vols. Paris, 1634.
- Duplès-Agier, H. Registre Criminel du Châtelet de Paris (1389–1392). *Soc. des Bibliophiles Français*. 2 vols. Paris, 1861–4.
- Dupont, E. *See* Regnault, R.
- Dupont, G. Le Cotentin et ses Îles. 4 vols. Caen, 1870–85.
- Dupont-Ferrier, G. La Date de la Naissance de Jean d'Orléans Comte d'Angoulême. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. lvi. Paris, 1895.
— Histoire et signification du mot "aides" dans les institutions financières de la France. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. lxxxix. Paris, 1928.
- Durand, G. Ville d'Amiens. Inventaire sommaire des Archives communales. Paris, 1891, &c.
- Duranville, L. de. Essai historique et archéologique sur la Ville de Pont de l'Arche et sur l'Abbaye de notre Dame de Bonport. 2 vols. Rouen, 1856, 1870.
— Essai sur l'histoire de la Côte Sainte-Catherine et des Fortifications de la ville de Rouen. Paris, 1857.
- Dureau de la Malle, A. J. C. A. Mémoire sur la Population de la France au xiv^e siècle. In *Mém. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, ser. II, vol. xiv. Paris, 1845.
- Durham, F. H. English History from original Sources (1399–1485). London, 1902.

476 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Duro, C. Fernandez. *La Marina de Castilla*. Madrid, 1894.
- Durrieu, P. *Le Nom, le Blason et l'Origine de la Famille de l'Historien Juvénal des Ursins*. In *Ann. Bull. de la Soc. de l'Hist. de France*, vol. xxix. Paris, 1892.
- *Les Très Riches Heures de Jean Duc de Berry*. Paris, 1904.
- *Heures de Turin de Jean de France Duc de Berry*. Paris, 1902.
- *Les Souvenirs historiques dans les MSS. à Miniature de la Domination Anglaise en France*. Paris, 1905.
- *Deux Miniatures inédits de Jean Fouquet*. Paris, 1902.
- *Le Maître des Heures de Maréchal de Boucicaut*. In *Revue de l'Art ancien et moderne*, vols. xix, xx. Paris, 1906.
- *Le Boccace de Munich*. Munich, 1909.
- Duruy, V. *Histoire de France*. 2 vols. Paris, 1860.
- Dusevel, F. H. G. (1796–1881). *Histoire de la Ville d'Amiens*. 2 vols. Amiens, 1832.
- *Églises, Châteaux, Beffrois et Hôtels-de-ville de la Picardie*. 2 vols. Amiens, 1846.
- Duthilloeul, H. R. *Petites Histoires du Pays de Flandre et d'Artois*. Douai, 1835.
- Duthy, J. *Sketches of Hampshire*. Winchester, 1839.
- Duval-Pineu, A. *Histoire de France sous le Règne de Charles VI*. 2 vols. Paris, 1842.
- Duval-Pineu, V. (1767–1842). *La Jeunesse de Henry V*. In *Œuvres complètes*, vol. x. Brussels, 1824–5.
- Dvořak, M. *Die Fälschungen des Reichskanzlers Kasper Schlick*. In *Mitt. des Inst. für Oesterr. Geschichtsforschung*, vol. xxii. Vienna, 1901.
- Dyboski, R. *Carols and Songs from Richard Hill's MS*. E.E.T.S. London, 1908.
- Dynter, Edmund (c. 1382–1448). *Chronique des Ducs de Brabant*. Ed. P. F. X. Ram. *Collection de Chroniques Belges inédites*. 3 vols. Brussels, 1854–60.
- [E.H.R.] *English Historical Review*. London, 1886, &c.
- Earle, J. *The Philology of the English Tongue*. Oxford, 1892.
- Early Chancery Proceedings, List of*. 7 vols. London, 1901, &c.
- Earwaker, J. P. *East Cheshire Past and Present*. 2 vols. London, 1880.
- Ebendorfer, T. (1387–1464). *Chronica Regum Romanorum*. Ed. A. F. Pibram. In *Mitt. des Inst. für Oesterr. Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband ii*. Innsbruck, 1890.
- *Chronicon Austriacum*. In J. Pez, *Scriptores Rerum Austriacarum*, vol. ii.
- Echard, L. *History of England*. 3 vols. London, 1718.
- École des Chartes, Bibliothèque de l'*. Paris, 1839, &c.
- Edinburgh Review, The*. Edinburgh, 1803, &c.
- Edward the Confessor, *Lives of*. Ed. H. R. Luard. R.S. London, 1858.
- Edwards, H. S. *Old and New Paris*. 2 vols. London, 1893–4.
- Ehrle, F. *Aus den Acten des Afterconcils von Perpignan*. In *Archiv für Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, vols. v, vii. Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1889, 1893.
- [Ellacombe, H. T.] *Accounts of the Executors of Richard (Gravesend) Bishop of London, 1303, and Thomas (Bitton) Bishop of Exeter, 1310*. Ed. W. H. Hale and H. T. Ellacombe. Camden Soc. London, 1874.
- Eller, I. *History of Belvoir Castle*. London, 1841.
- Ellis, H. *See* Original Letters.
- Elmham, Thomas. *Liber Metricus*. In *Memorials of Henry V*. Ed. C. A. Cole. R.S. London, 1858.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 477

- Elmham, Thomas. *Historia Monasterii S. Augustini Cantuariensis*. Ed. C. Hardwick. R.S. London, 1858.
- Emilio, P. (d. 1529). *De Rebus Gestis Francorum*. Basle, 1601.
- Emmerig, O. *The Bataile of Agyncourt*. Nürnberg, 1907.
- *Dariusbrief und Tennisballgeschichte*. In *Englische Studien*, vol. xxxix. Leipzig, 1908.
- Engbrechtsz, P., *Accounts of (1416–1417)*. Ed. J. P. Sisc. In *Kronijk van het Historisch Gezelschap te Utrecht*, ser. 11, jaargang 8. Utrecht, 1852.
- Engelsheim or Engelsom, D. (d. after 1444). *Liber dissensionum archiepiscopi Coloniensis et capituli Paderbornensis*. In *Ergänzungshefte zur Zeitschrift für vaterländische Geschichte und Alterthumskunde*, vol. li. Münster, s.d.
- Englefield, H. C. *A Walk through Southampton*. Southampton, 1801.
- Englische Studien*. Heilbronn and Leipzig, 1877, &c.
- English Cookery five hundred years ago (The forme of Cury)*. Ed. C. Clark. Totham, 1849.
- Enlart, C. *Monuments religieux dans la Région picarde*. Amiens, 1895.
- Epistolae Academicae Oxonienses*. Ed. H. Anstey. Oxford Hist. Soc. 2 vols. Oxford, 1898.
- Erredge, J. A. *History of Brighthelmston*. Brighton, 1862.
- Escouchy, Mathieu d'. *Chronique*. Ed. G. du Fresne de Beaucourt. Soc. de l'Hist. de France. 3 vols. Paris, 1863–4.
- Esquerrier, A. and Miégevillle (fl. c. 1460). *Chroniques Romanes des Comtes de Foix*. Foix, 1895.
- Essenwein, A. *Quellen zur Geschichte der Feuerwaffen*. Leipzig, 1872.
- Essex Herald*, The. Chelmsford, 1812, &c.
- Essex Review*, The. Chelmsford, 1892, &c.
- Eubel, K. *Hierarchia Catholica Medii Ævi*. 2 vols. Münster, 1898, 1901, with corrections in *Historisches Jahrbuch*, vol. xix, pp. 476 sqq.
- *Die Provisiones Prelatorum während des grossen Schismas*. In *Römische Quartalschrift*, vol. vii. Rome, 1893.
- *Zur Geschichte des grossen abendländischen Schismas*. *Ibid.* vol. viii. Rome, 1894.
- Eulogium Historiarum*. Ed. F. S. Haydon. R.S. 3 vols. London, 1858–63.
- Evans, J. *Edmund of Langley and his Tomb*. In *Archaeologia*, vol. xlvi. London, 1881.
- Evans, J. *Richmond and its vicinity*. Richmond, 1825.
- Evans, R. H. *Old Ballads, Historical and Narrative*. 4 vols. London, 1810.
- Evelyn, J. *Diary*. Ed. W. Bray. 4 vols. London, 1850–2.
- Even, E. van. *Louvain dans le Passé et dans le Présent*. Louvain, 1895.
- Ewald, A. C. *See* D.K.R.
- Excerpta Historica*. Ed. S. Bentley. London, 1833.
- Exchequer Rolls of Scotland*. Ed. G. Burnet. 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1876–80.
- Exeter city muniments*. In *Notes and Gleanings of Devon and Cornwall*, vols. ii–v, passim. Exeter, 1889–92.
- Eyriès, G. *Les Châteaux historiques de la France*. 3 vols. Paris, 1877–81.
- Fabric Rolls of York Minster*. Ed. J. Raine. Surtees Soc. Durham, 1859.
- Fabricius, J. (1668–1736). *Bibliotheca Latina mediae et infimae aetatis*. 6 vols. Padua, 1754.
- Fabyan, R. (d. 1513). *New Chronicles of England and France*. London, 1811.
- Fages, H. *Histoire de St Vincent Ferrier*. 2 vols. Paris, 1894. 3 vols. Paris, 1901.

478 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Fages, H. Notes et Documents de l'Histoire de St Vincent Ferrier. Louvain, 1905.
- Fagniez, G. Inventaires du Trésor de Notre Dame de Paris. In *Revue Archéologique*, vol. xxvii. Paris, 1874.
- Fragment d'un Répertoire de Jurisprudence parisienne au xv^e siècle. In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. xvii. Paris, 1891.
- Faguet, E. Histoire de la Littérature française jusqu'à la Fin du xvi^e siècle. Paris, 1900.
- Fairholt, F. W. Lord Mayor's Pageants. Percy Soc. London, 1843.
- Fallue, L. Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Église métropolitaine et du Diocèse de Rouen. 4 vols. Rouen, 1850-1.
- Famous Victories of Henry the Fifth containing the honorable battel of Agincourt. Shakespeare Quarto Facsimiles, no. 39. London, 1887.
- Faraglia, N. F. Storia della Regina Giovanna II d'Angio. Lanciano, 1904.
- Faria y Sousa, M. de (1590-1649). *Historia del Reyno de Portugal*. Brussels, 1730. Translated by J. Stevens. London, 1698.
- Farin, N. (1604-1675). Histoire de la Ville de Rouen. 2 vols. Rouen, 1738.
- Le Château Fortifié. Ed. J. Félix. Rouen, 1884.
- Fasciculi Zizaniorum. Ed. W. W. Shirley. R.S. London, 1858.
- Fauquembergue, C. de. Journal, 1417-1435. Ed. A. Tuetey and H. Lacaillé. Soc. de l'Hist. de France. 3 vols. Paris, 1903-15.
- Feasey, H. J. and Micklethwaite, J. T. Westminster Abbey historically described. London, 1899.
- Fejer, G. (1766-1851). *Codex diplomaticus Hungariae ecclesiasticus et civilis*. 40 vols. Buda, 1829-44.
- Félibien, M. (1666-1719). Histoire de la Ville de Paris. 5 vols. Paris, 1725.
- Histoire de l'Abbaye royale de St Denys en France. Paris, 1706.
- Félice, Ph. de. L'autre Monde. Mythes et Légendes. Le Purgatoire de St Patrice. Paris, 1906.
- Félix, J. Comptes rendus des Échevins de Rouen. 2 vols. Rouen, 1890.
- Fenin, P. de. Mémoires. Ed. L. M. E. Dupont. Soc. de l'Hist. de France. Paris, 1837.
- Feret, P. La Faculté de Théologie de Paris et ses Docteurs les plus célèbres: Moyen Age. 4 vols. Paris, 1894-7.
- Ferrer, V. (1350-1419). Œuvres. Ed. H. Fages. Paris, 1909, &c.
- Ferrusac, A. de (1786-1836). *Bulletin universel des Sciences et de l'Industrie*. Paris, 1823-30.
- Fervel, J. N. Histoire de Nice et des Alpes Maritimes. Paris, 1862.
- Feudal Aids, Inquisitions and Assessments relating to. 6 vols. London, 1899-1921.
- Feuillerat, A. Documents relating to the Office of the Revels in the time of Queen Elizabeth. Louvain, 1908.
- Ffoulkes, C. Armour and Weapons. Oxford, 1907.
- Fichot, C. Statistique monumentale du Département de l'Aube. 3 vols. Troyes, 1884-94.
- Fifty Earliest English Wills (1387-1439). Ed. F. J. Furnivall. E.E.T.S. London, 1882.
- Figanière, F. F. de la. Catalogo dos Manuscriptos Portugueses existentes no Museu Britannico. Lisbon, 1853.
- Figgis, J. N. John Wyclif. In *Typical English Churchmen*, vol. ii. S.P.C.K. London, 1909.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 479

- Finke, H. *Acta Concilii Constanciensis*. 4 vols. Münster, 1896-1928.
- *Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils*. Paderborn, 1889.
- *Kleinere Quellenstudien zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils*. In *Historisches Jahrbuch*, vol. viii. Munich, 1889.
- Finot, J. *La Paix d'Arras, 1414-1415*. Nancy, 1906.
- *Étude historique sur les Relations Commerciales entre la France et la Flandre au Moyen Age*. Paris, 1894.
- *Relations Commerciales et Maritimes entre la Flandre et l'Espagne au Moyen Age*. In *Annales du Comité flamand de France*, vol. xxiv. Lille, 1898.
- Fisher, H. A. L. *History of England, 1485-1547*. London, 1906.
- Fishwick, H. *History of the Parish of St Michael's-on-Wyre*. Chetham Society. N.S. vol. xxv. Manchester, 1891.
- Flammermont, J. *Histoire de Senlis pendant la seconde Partie de la guerre de Cent Ans (1405-1441)*. In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. v. Paris, 1879.
- Flandre, La. *Revue des Monuments d'Histoire et d'Antiquités*. Bruges, 1867, &c.
- Flavigny, C. *Sainte Brigitte de Suède, sa Vie, ses Révélationes et ses Œuvres*. Paris, 1892.
- Fleming, W. *Life of St George the Martyr*. London, 1901.
- Fletcher, C. R. L. *An Introductory History of England from the earliest times to the close of the Middle Ages*. London, 1904.
- Fletcher, C. R. L. and Kipling, R. *A History of England*. Oxford, 1911.
- Fletcher, C. R. L. and Walker, E. *Historical Portraits (1400-1600)*. Oxford, 1909.
- Fletcher, J. S. *Picturesque History of Yorkshire*. 6 vols. London, 1903-4.
- Fletcher, W. G. D. *The Black Friars at Oxford*. Oxford, 1882.
- Flete, J. (d. 1468). *History of Westminster Abbey*. Ed. J. A. Robinson. Cambridge, 1909.
- Fleury, C. (1640-1725). *Histoire Ecclésiastique*. 34 vols. Paris, 1722-34.
- *Histoire du Christianisme*. 6 vols. Paris, 1837.
- Fleury, J. and Vallée, H. *Cherbourg et ses Environs*. Cherbourg, 1840.
- Floquet, P. A. (1797-1881). *Essai Historique sur l'Échiquier de Normandie*. Rouen, 1840.
- *Histoire du Parlement de Normandie*. 7 vols. Rouen, 1840-2.
- Flourac, L. *Jean I^{er} Comte de Foix*. Paris, 1884.
- Foedera, App. *See* C. P. Cooper.
- Fonblanque, E. B. de. *Annals of the House of Percy*. 2 vols. London, 1887.
- Foppens, J. F. (1689-1761). *Bibliotheca Belgica*. 2 vols. Brussels, 1739.
- [For. Accts. P.R.O.] *List of Foreign Accounts enrolled on the Great Rolls of the Exchequer*. London, 1900.
- Forbes-Leith, W. *The Scots Men-at-Arms and Life Guards in France (1418-1830)*. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1882.
- Fordun. *See* *Scotichronicon*.
- Forestié, E. *La Variation des Monnaies au Début de la Guerre de Cent Ans*. In *Bulletin archéologique et historique de la Soc. archéologique de Tarn-et-Garonne*, vol. x. Montauban, 1882.
- Forme of Cury. *See* *English Cookery*.
- Formeville, H. *Notice sur les francs brements-canonniers de la Ville de Caen*. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xi. Caen, 1840.

480 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- [Forshall-Madden.] The Holy Bible in the earliest English Versions. Ed. J. Forshall and F. Madden. 4 vols. Oxford, 1850.
- Forster, J. Sir John Eliot. London, 1864.
- Forster, M. Eine nordenglische Cato Version. In *Englische Studien*, vol. xxxvi. Leipzig, 1905.
- Forsyth, W. History of Trial by Jury. London, 1852.
- Fortescue, Sir John (1394-1476). The Governance of England. Ed. C. Plummer. Oxford, 1885.
- Fortescue, J. W. The History of the British Army. London, 1899, &c.
- Fosbrooke, T. D. History of the City of Gloucester. London, 1819.
- Foss, E. (1787-1870). Hackington or St Stephen's Canterbury. In *Archaeologia Cantiana*, vol. ii. London, 1858.
- The Judges of England. 4 vols. London, 1848-51.
- *Biographia juridica: A bibliographical dictionary of the judges of England*. London, 1870.
- Foster, J. Some Feudal Coats of Arms. Oxford, 1902.
- The Baronetage and Knightage of the British Empire. Westminster, 1882.
- *Collectanea Genealogica*. London, 1881, &c.
- Foucart. Poitiers et ses Monuments. In *Mém. de la Soc. des Antiquaires de l'Ouest*. Poitiers, 1841.
- Foucquet, J. (c. 1420-1480). Heures de Maistre Estienne Chevalier. Ed. H. L. Curmer. 2 vols. Paris, 1866.
- Four Masters, Annals of the kingdom of Ireland by the. Ed. J. O'Donovan. 7 vols. Dublin, 1856.
- Fournier, M. Les Statuts et Privilèges des Universités françaises depuis leur Fondation jusqu'en 1789. 3 vols. Paris, 1890.
- Fox-Bourne, R. H. Famous London Merchants. London, 1868.
- *English Merchants*. London, 1886.
- Foxe, J. (1517-1587). Acts and Monuments. 3 vols. London, 1641.
- France, A. Vie de Jeanne d'Arc. 4 vols. Paris, 1910.
- Frati, L. Il Purgatorio de S. Patrizio secondo Stefano de Bourbon ed Uberto da Romano. In *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, vol. viii. Turin, 1886.
- Tradizioni Storiche del Purgatorio di San Patrizio. *Ibid.* vol. xvii. Turin, 1891.
- Frayse, C. Le Folk-Lore du Baugeois. Bauge, 1906.
- Freeman, E. A. (1823-1892). *Historical Essays*. 4 vols. London, 1871-92.
- *Historical Geography of Europe, with Atlas*. London, 1903.
- The Reign of William Rufus. 2 vols. Oxford, 1882.
- Exeter. London, 1887.
- Fremenville, J. Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Loire. St Étienne, 1905.
- French, G. R. *Shakespeareana Genealogica*. London, 1869.
- Freshfield, H. Wills, Leases, and Memoranda in the Book of Records of the Church of St Christopher-le-Stocks. London, 1895.
- Fréville, E. Mémoire sur le Commerce maritime de Rouen. 2 vols. Rouen, 1857.
- Fréville, V. Les Ducs de Normandie. Limoges, 1876.
- Fromentin, C. A. Hesdin. Arras, 1865.
- Fromme, B. Die spanische Nation und das Konstanzer Konzil. Münster, 1896.
- Froude, J. A. History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. 12 vols. London, 1870-5.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 481

- Fuller, Thomas. History of the Worthies of England. Ed. J. Nichols. 2 vols. London, 1811.
- Ecclesiastical History of Britain. Ed. J. S. Brewer. 6 vols. Oxford, 1845.
- Fuller-Maitland, J. A. English Carols of the Fifteenth Century. London, 1891.
- Furnivall, F. J. Captain Cox, his Ballads and Books. Ballad Society. London, 1871.
- Gachard, L. P. Analectes Belges. Brussels, 1830.
- Gaguin, R. (1425–1501). De Francorum Gestis Annales. Paris, 1521.
- La Mer des Chroniques et Miroir historial de France. Paris, 1527.
- Compendium supra Francorum gestis. Paris, 1497.
- Gaidoz-Rolland. *See* Melusine.
- Gaillard, A. Le Conseil de Brabant. Brussels, 1898.
- Gaillardet, F. and Dumas, A. La Tour de Nesle. In *La France Dramatique*. Paris, 1847.
- Gaimar, Geoffrey. Lestorie des Engles. Ed. T. D. Hardy and C. T. Martin. R.S. 2 vols. London, 1888–9.
- Gairdner, J. The Houses of Lancaster and York. London, 1874.
- Lollardy and the Reformation in England. 4 vols. London, 1908, &c.
- Early Chroniclers of England. London, 1879.
- Gale, T. Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores. 3 vols. Oxford, 1684–91.
- Galeron, J. F. Histoire et Description de Falaise. Falaise, 1830.
- Statistique de l'Arrondissement de Falaise. 3 vols. Falaise, 1826–8.
- Galland, A. (d. c. 1645). Des anciennes Enseignes et Estandarts de France. Paris, 1637.
- Gallia Christiana. Ed. D. de Ste Marthe, &c. 16 vols. Paris, 1715, &c.
- Gallia Christiana novissima. Ed. J. H. Albanès. Montbéliard, 1899, &c.
- Galliard, E. Siège de Rouen en 1418. In *Précis analytique de l'Académie de Rouen*. Rouen, 1834.
- Gallwey, R. P. The Crossbow, its Construction, History and Management. London, 1903.
- Galton, A. Church and State in France. London, 1907.
- Galvano, A. (1503–1557). The Discoveries of the World. Ed. C. R. D. Bethune. Hakluyt Society. London, 1862.
- Games, Gutierre Diez de (1379–1450). Le Victorial. Chronique de Don Pedro Niño. Translated by A. de Circourt and the Count of Puymaigre. Paris, 1867.
- Gams, P. B. Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae. Ratisbon, 1873.
- Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien. 3 vols. Ratisbon, 1862–76.
- Gardiner, S. R. Student's History of England. London, 1892.
- Gardiner, S. R. and Mullinger, J. B. Introduction to the Study of English History. London, 1881.
- Gardner, J. S. Armour in England. London, 1897.
- Foreign Armour in England. London, 1898.
- Garnett, R. Richmond on the Thames. London, 1896.
- Garnett, R. and Gosse, E. English Literature. 4 vols. London, 1903.
- Garnier, J. (b. 1818). L'Artillerie de la Commune de Dijon. In *Annuaire du Département de la Côte d'Or*. Dijon, 1893.
- Notice historique sur la Maladrerie de Dijon. In *Mém. de l'Acad. de Dijon*, ser. II, vol. II. Dijon, 1854.
- Documents relatifs à la Surprise de Paris par les Bourguignons in Mai 1418. In *Bull. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, année IV. Paris, 1877.
- Garnier, N. La Côte d'Or. Moulins, *s.a.*

482 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- [Gascoigne, T. *Collectanea historica e Dictionario Theologico T. Gascoignii*. Ed. T. Hearne. Oxford, 1731.
- Gaspey, T. *The Life and Times of the Good Lord Cobham*. 2 vols. London, 1843.
- *The Lollards. A Tale*. 3 vols. London, 1822.
- Gasquet, A. *Précis des Institutions politiques et sociales de l'ancienne France*. 2 vols. Paris, 1885.
- Gasquet, F. A. *The Old English Bible and other Essays*. London, 1908.
- *Some Notes on Mediaeval Libraries*. Yeovil, 1891.
- *The Pall, a Pledge for the Unity of the Catholic Faith*. London, 1892.
- Gasté, A. *Chansons Normandes du xv^e siècle*. Caen, 1866.
- *Les Vaux de Vire de Jean Le Houx*. Paris, 1875.
- *Olivier Basselin et le Vau de Vire*. Paris, 1887.
- Gaufreteau, J. de (d. 1623). *Chronique Bourdeloise*. Ed. J. Delpit. 2 vols. Bordeaux, 1877-88.
- Gaujel, A. F. (1772-1856). *Études historiques sur le Rouergue*. 4 vols. Paris, 1858.
- [Gaunt Reg.] *John of Gaunt's Register (1372-1376)*. Ed. S. A. Smith. 2 vols. London, 1911.
- Gauthier, J. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Seine-et-Marne*. 5 vols. Paris, 1863-80.
- Gavard, J. D. C. Versailles. *Galérie historique*. 19 vols. Paris, 1838, &c.
- Gazanyola, J. (1766-1851). *Histoire du Roussillon*. Perpignan, 1857.
- Gazette Archéologique*. Paris, 1875-89.
- Gazette des Beaux Arts*. Paris, 1859, &c.
- Gebhart, E. *La Renaissance Italienne*. Paris, 1887.
- *Conteurs Florentins du Moyen Age*. Paris, 1901.
- Gee, H. and Hardy, W. J. *Documents illustrative of English Church History*. London, 1896.
- Gee, R. *The Two Langleys*. St Albans, 1857.
- Geiger, L. *Renaissance und Humanismus in Italien und Deutschland*. Berlin, 1882.
- Gelis-Didot, P. and Grassoreille, G. *Le Château de Bourbon-l'Archambault*. Paris, 1887.
- Genealogist*. Ed. G. W. Marshall and W. D. Selby. London, 1877, &c.
- [Gent's Mag.] *Gentleman's Magazine*. London, 1731, &c.
- George, H. B. *Battles of English History*. London, 1895.
- *The Archers at Crécy*. In *Eng. Hist. Rev.* vol. x. London, 1895.
- George, H. B. and Sidgwick, A. *Poems of England*. London, 1896.
- Gerson, Jean (1363-1429). *Opera Omnia*. Ed. L. E. Dupin. 5 vols. Antwerp, 1706.
- Geruzet, E. *Histoire de la Littérature Française*. 2 vols. Paris, 1866.
- Gerville, C. A. A. *Sur les anciennes Châteaux du Département de la Manche*. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. i. Caen, 1825.
- Geslin de Bourgogne, J. and Barthélemy, A. de. *Anciens Évêchés de Bretagne*. 4 vols. Paris, 1855-64.
- [Gesta.] *Henrici Quinti Angliae Regis Gesta*. Ed. B. Williams. *English Historical Society*. London, 1850.
- Giannone, P. (1676-1748). *History of Naples*. Trans. J. Ogilvie. 2 vols. London, 1729-31.
- Gibbons, A. *Early Lincoln Wills*. Lincoln, 1888.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 483

- Giblet, H. *Histoire des Rois de Chypre*. Trans. H. G. C. Chevalier. 2 vols. Paris, 1732.
- Gidley, J. *Royal Visits to Exeter*. Exeter, 1863.
- Statement relating to William Wynard's Charity in Exeter. Exeter, 1865.
- Gierth, W. *Die Vermittelungsversuche Kaiser Sigmunds zwischen Frankreich und England im Jahre 1416*. Halle, 1895.
- Gifford, J. *The History of France*. 4 vols. London, 1793.
- Gilbert, J. T. *Facsimiles of National MSS. of Ireland*. 4 parts. London and Southampton, 1874-84.
- *Viceroy's of Ireland*. Dublin, 1865.
- Gilles, N. (d. 1503). *Annales et Chroniques de France*. Paris, 1549.
- Gilliodts van Severen, A. *Bruges ancienne et moderne*. Brussels, 1893.
- *Cartulaire de l'ancienne Étaple de Bruges*. 4 vols. Bruges, 1904-7.
- *Inventaire des Chartes*. In *Inventaires des Archives de la Ville de Bruges*. 4 vols. Bruges, 1876.
- *Le Cotton Manuscrit Galba, B. i.* In *Collection de Chroniques Belges inédites*. Brussels, 1896.
- Gilpin, W. *The Lives of Wickliffe, Lord Cobham, John Huss, Jerome of Prague and Zisca*. London, 1765.
- Giraldus Cambrensis. *Opera*. Ed. J. S. Brewer, J. F. Dimock and G. F. Warner. R.S. 8 vols. London, 1861-91.
- Girardot, A. T. Baron de. *La Cathédrale de Bourges*. Moulins, 1849.
- [Gironde.] *Archives historiques du Département de la Gironde*. 12 vols. Paris, 1859-70.
- Giustiniani, A. (1470-1536). *Annali della Repubblica di Genova*. 2 vols. Genoa, 1854.
- Glassberger (or de Moravia), N. (d. after 1517). *Chronica*. In *Analecta Franciscana*, vol. ii. Quaracchi, 1887.
- Glover, S. (d. 1869). *History and Gazetteer of the County of Derby*. 2 vols. Derby, 1831-3.
- Godefroy, D. (1615-1681). *Histoire de Charles VI*. Paris, 1658.
- *Histoire de Charles VII*. Paris, 1661.
- Godefroy, F. *Dictionnaire de l'ancienne langue française*. 10 vols. Paris, 1880-92.
- [Godstow.] *Anonymi Chronicon Godstovianum*. Ed. T. Hearne. Oxford, 1716.
- Godwin, F. (1561-1633). *De Praesulibus Angliae*. Ed. W. Richardson. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1743.
- Goldast, M. (1576-1635). *Collectio Constitutionum Imperialium*. 4 vols. Frankfurt, 1713.
- *Imperatorum Statuta et Rescripta*. 3 vols. Frankfurt, &c., 1607-16.
- Goldie, F. *A Byegone* Oxford. London, 1881.
- Gollut, L. (1537-1595). *Mémoires historiques de la République Séquanoise et des Princes de la Franche Comté de Bourgogne*. Ed. C. L. E. Duvernoy. Artois, 1846.
- Gonse, L. *L'Art gothique, l'Architecture, la Peinture, la Sculpture, le Décor*. Paris, 1891.
- *La Sculpture française depuis le xiv^e siècle*. Paris, 1895.
- Goodwin, T. (1650-1715). *History of the Reign of Henry V*. London, 1704.
- Gostling, W. (1696-1777). *A Walk in and about the Cathedral of Canterbury*. Canterbury, 1825.

484 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Gouget, A. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Gironde.* Bordeaux, 1892.
- Gough, R. *An Account of a rich Illuminated Missal executed for John Duke of Bedford, Regent of France under Henry VI.* London, 1794.
- *History of Pleshy.* London, 1803.
- *Sepulchral Monuments.* 3 vols. London, 1786–99.
- Gouvenain, L. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives communales de la ville de Dijon.* Paris, 1867.
- Gower, J. *Complete Works.* Ed. G. C. Macaulay. 4 vols. Oxford, 1899–1902.
- *Confessio Amantis.* Ed. R. Pauli. 3 vols. London, 1857.
- Gower, R. S. *The Tower of London.* 2 vols. London, 1901.
- Grabl, H. *Geschichte des Egerlandes.* Prague, 1893.
- Graes (or Gratus), O. (d. 1541). *Fasciculus rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum.* Ed. E. Brown. 2 vols. London, 1690.
- Grasse, J. G. T. *Trésor de Livres rares et précieux.* 7 vols. Dresden, 1859–69.
- Graetz, H. (d. 1891). *History of the Jews.* Trans. B. Löwy. 5 vols. London, 1891–2.
- Grande Encyclopédie. 31 vols. Paris, 1887–1902.
- Grandes Chroniques de France. Ed. Paulin Paris. Paris, 1836–40.
- Grandmaison, C. de. *Nouveaux Documents sur les États Généraux du xv^e siècle.* (Mémoire lu aux réunions de la Sorbonne.) Paris, 1876.
- Granger, J. (1723–1776). *A Biographical History of England from Egbert the Great to the Revolution: with continuation by M. Noble.* 7 vols. London, 1775–1806.
- Gras, M. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Gironde.* Paris, 1862, &c.
- Grassoreille, G. *Histoire politique du chapitre de Notre Dame de Paris pendant la domination anglaise.* In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. ix. Paris, 1883.
- Grave, M. *Archives Municipales de Mantes.* Paris, 1896.
- Gray, E. A. P. *The Roll of Battle Abbey so far as it relates to Lancashire and Cheshire.* In *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, vol. xlvi. Liverpool, 1895.
- Gray, T. (d. 1369). *Scalachronica.* Ed. H. Maxwell. London, 1907.
- Green, A. S. *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century.* 2 vols. London, 1908.
- Green, J. R. (1837–1883). *A Short History of the English People.* London, 1877. Illustrated edition. 4 vols. London, 1892–4.
- [Greg. Chron.] *Gregory's Chronicle.* In *Collections of a London Citizen.* Ed. J. Gairdner. Camden Soc. London, 1876.
- Gregorovius, F. *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter.* 8 vols. Stuttgart, 1878–91.
- Grey, E. C. W. *St Giles of the Lepers.* London, 1905.
- Grey Friars Chronicle. Ed. J. G. Nichols. Camden Soc. London, 1852. Also in *Monumenta Franciscana*, vol. ii.
- Griffiths, J. *Index to Wills proved in the University of Oxford.* Oxford, 1862.
- Grillet, J. L. (1756–1812). *Dictionnaire historique, littéraire et statique des Départements du Mont Blanc et du Léman.* 3 vols. Chambéry, 1807.
- Grisel, H. (1595–1677). *Fasti Rothomagenses.* Ed. F. Bouquet. 2 vols. Rouen, 1866–70.
- [Grocers' Archives.] *Facsimile of first volume of MS. Archives of the Company of Grocers.* Ed. J. A. Kingdon. 2 parts. London, 1886.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 485

- Grose, F. (1731-1791). *Military Antiquities respecting the History of the English Army*. 2 vols. London, 1801.
- *Antiquities of England and Wales*. 4 vols. London, 1773.
- Grosley, P. (b. 1718). *Mémoires historiques et critiques pour l'Histoire de Troyes*. 2 vols. Paris, 1774, 1812.
- *Éphémérides*. 2 vols. Paris, 1811.
- Gross, C. *A Bibliography of British Municipal History*. New York, 1897.
- *The Mediaeval Law of Intestacy*. Cambridge, Mass., 1904.
- *Select Cases concerning the Law Merchant*. Selden Soc. London, 1908.
- Grote, G. *History of Greece*. 8 vols. London, 1862.
- Grudé de la Croix du Maine, F. (1552-1592). *Les Bibliothèques Françaises*. 2 vols. Paris, 1772.
- Gruel, G. (fl. c. 1450). *Chronique d'Arthur de Richemont*. Ed. A. le Vavas seur. Soc. de l'Hist. de France. Paris, 1890.
- Gruyer, F. A. *Les quarante Fouquet*. Paris, 1897.
- Grynæus, S. *Novus orbis regionum*. Basel, 1537.
- Guadet, J. *Atlas géographique, historique, politique, et administratif de la France*. Paris, 1828.
- Guérin, L. *Histoire Maritime de France*. 6 vols. Paris, 1859-61.
- Guérinière, J. *Histoire générale du Poitou*. 2 vols. Poitiers, 1838-40.
- Guessard, F. (1814-1882). *Gauluet ou le Sire de Gaule (1380-1423)*. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. ix. Paris, 1847-8.
- Guichenon, S. (1607-1664). *Histoire de la Souveraineté de Dombes*. Ed. M. C. Gigue. 2 vols. Lyons, 1874.
- *Histoire généalogique de la Maison de Savoie*. 4 vols. Turin, 1778-80.
- Guiffrey, J. *Inventaires de Jean Duc de Berry (1401-1416)*. 2 vols. Paris, 1894-6.
- Guilhermy, R. F. M. N. *Monographie de l'église royale de St Denis*. Paris, 1848.
- *La Sainte Chapelle de Paris*. Paris, 1857.
- *Itinéraire Archéologique de Paris*. Paris, 1855.
- Guinness, H. G. *Creation centred in Christ*. 2 vols. London, 1896.
- Guinodé, R. C. *Histoire de Libourne et des autres villes et bourgs de son Arrondissement*. 3 vols. Bordeaux, 1845.
- Guizot, F. P. J. (1787-1871). *Histoire de France depuis les Temps les plus reculés jusqu'en 1789, racontée à mes petits enfants*. 5 vols. Paris, 1872-6.
- Guthrie, W. *General History of England*. 3 vols. London, 1744-51.
- Guzman, F. Perez de (1405-1470). *Cronica del serenissimo Rey Don Juan segundo*. Pamplona, 1591.
- Haggard, A. C. P. *The France of Joan of Arc*. London, 1911.
- Haines, H. *Manual of Monumental Brasses*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1861.
- Haitze, P. J. (1657-1737). *Histoire de la Ville d'Aix*. 4 vols. Aix, 1880-9.
- Hakluyt, R. (1553-1616). *The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation*. 3 vols. London, 1599-1600. 5 vols. London, 1809.
- Hale, M. (1609-1676). *The History of the Pleas of the Crown*. Ed. T. Dogherty. 2 vols. London, 1800.
- Hale, W. H. *The Carthusian Monastery of London*. In *London and Middlesex Archaeological Soc. Transactions*, vol. iii, part v. London, 1869.
- Hales, J. W. and Furnivall, F. J. *Bishop Percy's Folio Manuscript*. 4 vols. London, 1867-8.
- Hall, H. *Studies in English Official Historical Documents*. Cambridge, 1908.

486 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Hall, H. *Antiquities and Curiosities of the Exchequer*. London, 1891.
- Halle, E. (c. 1498–1547). *The Union of the two Noble and Illustre Families of Lancaster and Yorke*. London, 1809.
- Haller, J. *England und Rom unter Martin V.* In *Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken*. Königl. preussisch. historisch. Institut in Rom, vol. viii. Rome, 1905.
- Halliwell, J. O. *Dictionary of Archaic and Provincial Words*. 2 vols. London, 1852.
- *Letters of the Kings of England*. 2 vols. London, 1848.
- *The Earliest Naval Ballads of England*. Percy Society. London, 1841.
- Hamerton, P. G. *Paris in Old and Present Times*. London, 1855.
- Hamilton, A. *The Angel of Syon*. Edinburgh, 1905.
- Hammerich, F. *St Birgitta, die nordische Prophetin und Ordensstifterin*. Trans. A. Michelson. Gotha, 1872.
- Hammond, E. P. *Chaucer. A Biographical Manual*. New York, 1908.
- *The Departing of Chaucer*. In *Modern Philology*, vol. i. Chicago, 1903–4.
- Hampson, R. T. *Medii Ævi Calendarium*. 2 vols. London, 1841.
- Hancock, F. *Minehead in the County of Somerset*. Taunton, 1905.
- *Dunster Church and Priory*. Taunton, 1905.
- Hanotaux, G. *Jeanne d'Arc*. Paris, 1911.
- Hansrecesse (1256–1418). Ed. K. Koppmann. 6 vols. Leipzig, 1870–89.
- Harbaville, M. *Mémorial historique et archéologique du Département du Pas-de-Calais*. 2 vols. Arras, 1842.
- Harbert, W. (b. 1583). *Poems*. Ed. A. B. Grosart. In *Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies' Library*. London, 1870.
- Harcourt, L. W. *Vernon. His Grace the Steward and the Trial of Peers*. London, 1907.
- *The Two Sir John Fastolfs*. In *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. iii, vol. iv. London, 1910.
- Harding, S. (1745–1809). *Shakespeare Illustrated*. London, 1793.
- Hardt, H. von der (1660–1746). *Magnum Oecumenicum Concilium Constantiense*. 7 vols. Helmstadt, 1697–1740.
- Hardy, E. *La Guerre de Cent Ans*. Paris, 1879.
- Hardy, Elizabeth. *Owen Glendower, or the Prince in Wales*. 2 vols. London, 1849.
- Hardy, J. S. *Literary Remains*. Ed. J. G. Nichols. Westminster, 1852.
- Hardy, T. D. *Syllabus of Rymer's Foedera*. 3 vols. London, 1869–85.
- *A descriptive catalogue of materials relating to the history of Great Britain and Ireland, to the end of the reign of Henry VII.* R.S. 3 vols. London, 1862–71. *See also* *Rotuli Normanniæ*.
- Hardy, W. J. and Page, W. *Calendar to the Feet of Fines for London and Middlesex*. 2 vols. London, 1892–3.
- Hardyng, John (1378–c. 1470). *Chronicle*. Ed. H. Ellis. London, 1812.
- [Harflot.] *The Siege of Harflot and the Batayl of Egincourt attributed to J. Lydgate*. In N. H. Nicolas, *History of the Battle of Agincourt*; also W. C. Hazlitt, vol. ii, pp. 88–108.
- [Harl. Cat.] *A Catalogue of the Harleian Collection of Manuscripts preserved in the British Museum*. 4 vols. London, 1808–12.
- Harleian Miscellany*. Ed. W. Oldys (1696–1761) and T. Park. 10 vols. London, 1808–13.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 487

- Harleian Society, The. Publications. London, 1869, &c.
- Harpsfield, N. (1519-1575). *Historia Anglicana Ecclesiastica*. Douai, 1622.
- Harris, J. *The History of Kent*. London, 1719.
- Harris, M. D. *Life in an Old English Town. A History of Coventry from the Earliest Times*. London, 1898.
- *The Story of Coventry*. London, 1911.
- Hartshorne, C. H. *Feudal and Military Antiquities of Northumberland*. London, 1858.
- Hartwright, H. *The Story of the House of Lancaster*. London, 1897.
- Hassall, A. *A Class-book of English History*. London, 1901.
- Hasted, E. *History of Kent*. 4 vols. Canterbury, 1778-99.
- Hastings, T. *The British Archer*. London, 1831.
- Hauser, A. *Études critiques sur les sources narratives de l'Histoire de France au xv^e siècle*. In *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, vol. v (1905).
- Hauteclouque, G. de. *Arrondissement de St Pol*. In *Dictionnaire historique et archéologique du Département du Pas-de-Calais*, vol. ii. Arras, 1880.
- Hawkins, E. *Description of the Anglo-Gallic Coins in the British Museum*. London, 1826.
- Hay, J. Swift. *The Mystery of his Life and Love*. London, 1891.
- Hazlitt, W. Carew. *Remains of the Early Popular Poetry of England*. 4 vols. London, 1864-6.
- *The Livery Companies of the City of London*. London, 1892.
- Healy, J. *Life and Writings of St Patrick*. Dublin, 1905.
- Heda, G. *See* Beka, J. de.
- Hefele, C. J. von. *Conciliengeschichte*. 9 vols. Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1873-90.
- Hefner-Alteneck, J. H. *Trachten, Kunstwerke und Gerätschaften vom früheren Mittelalter*. 3 vols. Frankfurt, &c., 1840-54.
- Hegel, C. *Die Chroniken der Stadt Cöln*. In *Die Chroniken der deutschen Städte*. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1875-7.
- Heigel, K. *Die Wittelsbacher*. Munich, 1880.
- Heiss, A. *Les Médailleurs de la Renaissance*. 8 vols. Paris, 1881-92.
- *Descripcion general de las Monedas Hispano-Cristianas*. 3 vols. Madrid, 1865-9.
- Hellot, A. *Essai historique sur les Martel de Basqueville et sur Basqueville-en-Caux*. Rouen, 1879.
- *Récit du Siège d'Harfleur en 1415*. Rouen, 1881. *See* Petit, J.
- Henaux, F. *Histoire du Pays de Liège*. 2 vols. Liège, 1872-4.
- Henderson, E. F. *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*. London, 1892.
- Henley, Walter of (c. 1156). *Husbandry*. Ed. E. Lamond. London, 1890.
- Hennebert, J. B. F. *Histoire générale de la Province d'Artois*. 3 vols. Lille and St Omer, 1786-9.
- Hennessy, G. *Novum Repertorium Ecclesiasticum Parochiale Londinense*. London, 1898.
- Henry, D. M. J. *Histoire de Roussillon*. 2 vols. Paris, 1835.
- Henry, E. *Essai sur la vie politique de Gerson*. In *Travaux de l'Acad. Impériale de Reims*, vol. xxi. Rheims, 1855.
- Henty, G. A. *At Agincourt. A Tale of the White Hoods of Paris*. London, 1897.
- Herbert, J. A. *A Catalogue of the Romances in the Department of MSS. in the British Museum*. Vol. iii. London, 1910.

488 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Herbert, W. History of the Twelve Great Livery Companies of London. 2 vols. London, 1836-7.
- Héricault, C. J. Poésies complètes de Charles d'Orléans. 2 vols. Paris, 1874.
- Héricourt, A. Les Sièges d'Arras. Arras, 1844.
- Hermant, J. Histoire du Diocèse de Bayeux. Caen, 1725.
- Héron, A. Deux Chroniques de Rouen. Rouen, 1900.
- Heuterus, P. (1535-1602). Rerum Burgundicarum libri sex. The Hague, 1639.
- Hewitt, J. Ancient Armour and Weapons in Europe. 3 vols. London, 1855-60.
- Hewlett, L. M. Anglo-Gallic coins. London, 1920.
- Heylyn, P. (1600-1662). The History of that most famous Saynt and Souldier of Jesus Christ St George of Cappadocia. London, 1823.
- Hiatt, C. Westminster Abbey. London, 1902.
- Higden, Ralph (d. 1364). Polychronicon. Ed. C. Babington and J. R. Lumby. R.S. 9 vols. London, 1865-86.
- Higgins, L. E. Women of Europe in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. 2 vols. London, 1885.
- Hime, H. W. L. Gunpowder and Ammunition; their Origin and Progress. London, 1904.
- Hippeau, C. L'Abbaye de St Étienne de Caen. Caen, 1855.
- Hirsch, Th., Toeppert, M. and Strehlke, E. Scriptores rerum Prussicarum. 5 vols. Leipzig, 1861-74.
- Historians' History of the World. Ed. H. S. Williams. 25 vols. London, 1904-7.
- Historical Manuscripts. Commissioners' Reports. London, 1870, &c.
- Historical Monuments (England), Royal Commission on. An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in London. Vol. i. Westminster Abbey. London, 1924.
- Hoare, R. C. (1758-1838). History of Modern Wiltshire. 6 vols. London, 1822-44.
- Hoccleve, T. (1369-c. 1450). Minor Poems. Ed. F. J. Furnivall. E.E.T.S. London, 1892.
- The Regiment of Princes. Ed. F. J. Furnivall. E.E.T.S. London, 1897.
- Hochart, P. Nouvelles Considérations au sujet des Annales et des Histoires de Tacite. Paris, 1894.
- Hodgson, F. C. The Early History of Venice from the Foundation to the Conquest of Constantinople. London, 1901.
- Hodgson, J. History of Northumberland. 6 vols. Newcastle, 1827-35.
- Hoepffner, E. Eustache Deschamps. Leben und Werke. Strassbourg, 1904.
- Hoffbauer, F. Paris à travers les Ages. 2 vols. Paris, 1875-82.
- Hoffmann, H. Les monnaies royales de France. Paris, 1878.
- Holinshed, Raphael (d. c. 1580). Chronicles of England, Ireland, Scotland. 3 vols. in 2. London, 1587.
- Holmes, T. S. The Registers of Henry Bowett. In Somerset Record Society. London, 1899.
- Wells and Glastonbury. London, 1908.
- Holt, E. S. Lights in the Darkness. London, 1896.
- White Rose of Langley. London, 1875.
- Home Counties Magazine. London, 1899-1912.
- Homme, L. Histoire générale ecclésiastique et civile du Diocèse de Séez. 3 vols. Alençon, 1899-1900.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 489

- Hook, W. F. (1789-1875). *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*. 12 vols. London, 1861, &c.
— *Church Dictionary*. London, 1887.
- Hookham, M. A. *The Life and Times of Margaret of Anjou*. 2 vols. London, 1872.
- Hope, W. H. *St John. Heraldry for Craftsmen and Designers*. London, 1910.
— *The Stall Plates of the Knights of the Garter (1348-1485)*. Westminster, 1901.
— *The London Charterhouse and its Old Water Supply*. In *Archaeologia*, vol. lviii. London, 1902.
- Hopkins, Tighe. *The Dungeons of Old Paris*. London, 1898.
- Horsefield, T. W. (d. 1837). *History and Antiquities of Lewes*. 2 vols. Lewes, 1824-7.
- Horstmann, C. *Richard Rolle of Hampole and his Followers*. 2 vols. London, 1895-6.
- Hoskins, E. *Horae Beatae Mariae Virginis; or Sarum and York Primers*. London, 1901.
- Howard, J. J. *Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica*. London, 1868, &c.
- Hudson, F. *The Brasses of Northamptonshire*. London, 1853.
- Hudson, H. N. *Shakespeare. His Life, Art and Characters*. 2 vols. Boston, 1872.
- Huet, P. *Les Origines de la Ville de Caen*. Rouen, 1702.
- Hugo, T. *The Jerusalem Chamber*. In *Transactions of London and Middlesex Archaeological Soc.* vol. ii, part v. London, 1863.
— *The Hospital of the Papey in the City of London*. *Ibid.* vol. v. London, 1866.
- Huillard-Bréholles, J. L. A. (1818-1871). *Titres de la Maison Ducale de Bourbon*. In *Archives de l'Empire*. 2 vols. Paris, 1867, 1874.
— *La Raçon du Duc de Bourbon Jean I. In Mémoires présentés par divers Savants à l'Acad. des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres de l'Institut de France*, ser. 1, vol. viii. Paris, 1874.
— *Histoire générale du Moyen Age*. 2 vols. Paris, 1842.
- Hume, D., of Godscroft (b. c. 1560). *The Houses of Douglas and Angus*. Edinburgh, 1644.
- Hume, M. A. S. *The Spanish People*. London, 1901.
- Humphreys, H. N. *Illuminated Illustrations of Froissart*. 2 vols. London, 1844, &c.
— *Illuminated Books of the Middle Ages*. London, 1844.
- Hunter, J. *South Yorkshire*. 2 vols. London, 1828-31.
— *Agincourt. A Contribution towards an Authentic List of the Commanders of the English Host*. In *Critical and Historical Tracts*. London, 1850.
— *Proofs of the Early Use of Gunpowder in the English Army*. In *Archaeologia*, vol. xxiii. London, 1847.
- Hunter, R. *The Imperial Dictionary and Cyclopaedia*. 8 vols. London, 1902.
- Hurry, J. H. *Reading Abbey*. London, 1901.
- Husson, A. *Étude sur les Hôpitaux*. Paris, 1862.
- Hutchins, J. (1698-1773). *History of Dorset*. 4 vols. London, 1774, &c.
- Hutchinson, W. *A View of Northumberland*. 2 vols. Newcastle, 1778.
- Hymans, L. *Histoire populaire de la Belgique*. Brussels, 1860.
- Illustration, L'. Paris, 1843, &c.

490 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- [Imitatio Christi.] IV Livres de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ. Ed. H. L. Curmer. Paris, 1856, &c.
- Impens, P. (b. 1523). *Chronica Monachi Bethlehemitici*. Ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove. In *Chroniques relatives à l'Histoire de la Belgique sous la Domination des Ducs de Bourgogne*, vol. iii. Brussels, 1876.
- Infessura, S. (c. 1440-c. 1500). *Diario de la Città de Roma*. Ed. O. Tommasini. Rome, 1890.
- Ingram, J. *Memorials of Oxford*. 3 vols. Oxford, 1837.
- [Inq. post mort.] *Calendarium Inquisitionum post mortem*. 4 vols. London, 1806-28.
- Inquisitiones ad Quod Damnum, List of (P.R.O. Lists and Indexes, 17 and 22). 2 vols. London, 1904, 1906.
- Intermédiaire, L', des Chercheurs et Curieux. Paris, 1864, &c.
- Iolo MSS. Ed. E. Williams (1745-1827). Llandovery, 1848.
- Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények. Budapest, 1891, &c.
- Ironside, E. *Monumental Inscriptions in the church and churchyards of Isleworth, &c., in the county of Middlesex*. London, 1786.
- Isambert, F. (1792-1857). *Recueil Général des anciennes Lois françaises*. 29 vols. Paris, 1822-33.
- [Itin.] *Itinéraires de Philippe le Hardi et de Jean sans Peur (1369-1419)*. Ed. E. Petit. Collection de documents inédits. Paris, 1888.
- Izacke, R. *Antiquities of the City of Exeter*. London, 1677.
- Jackson, J. E. (1805-1891). *A Guide to Farleigh and Hungerford*. Chippenham, 1875.
- On the Hungerford Chapels in Salisbury Cathedral. Devizes, 1855.
- Leland's Journey through Wiltshire (1540-1542). Devizes, 1875.
- Jackson, T. G. *The Church of St Mary-the-Virgin, Oxford*. Oxford, 1897.
- Jacobs, J. *The London Jewry, 1290*. London, 1887.
- Jadart, H. *Jean de Gerson*. Rheims, 1881.
- Jaehns, M. I. *Handbuch einer Geschichte des Kriegswesens von der Urzeit bis zur Renaissance*. Leipzig, 1880.
- Jaillet, J. B. M. *Recherches critiques, historiques et topographiques sur la Ville de Paris*. 20 parts and 2 vols. of plans. Paris, 1772-5.
- Jal, Auguste. *Glossaire Nautique*. Paris, 1848.
- James, G. *Joan of Arc*. London, 1910.
- James, H. *Facsimiles of National manuscripts*. 4 parts. Southampton, 1865-8.
- James, R. *Poems*. Ed. A. B. Grosart. London, 1880.
- Jameson, J. *An etymological dictionary of the Scottish language*. 4 vols. Paisley, 1879-82.
- Janer, F. *Examen de los Sucesos y Circunstancias que motivaron el Compromiso de Caspe*. Madrid, 1855.
- Janicke, K. *Die Magdeburger Schöppenchronik*. In *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*. Leipzig, 1869.
- Janin, J. G. *La Normandie*. Paris, 1842.
- *Voyage de Paris à la Mer*. Paris, 1847.
- Janvier, A. *Boves et ses Seigneurs*. Amiens, 1877.
- Jarry, E. *La Vie Politique de Louis de France, duc d'Orléans (1372-1407)*. Paris, 1889.
- Jarry, L. *Jean Grancher de Trainou dit Jean d'Orléans*. In *Bulletin de la Société archéologique et historique de l'Orléanais*, vol. viii. Orléans, 1886.

- Jarry, L. Découvertes des Tombes de Marie d'Harcourt [&c.]. In *Mém. de la Soc. archéologique et historique de l'Orléanais*, vol. xxii. Orléans, 1889.
- Jeanroy, A. and Teulié, H. *Mystères Provençaux du xv^e siècle*. Toulouse, 1893.
- Jeanroy, A. and Vignaux, A. *Voyage du Purgatoire de St Patrice*. Visions de Tindal et de St Paul. Toulouse, 1903.
- Jeanroy, Felix V. *Histoire abrégée de la Littérature française*. Paris, 1892.
- Jenkins, A. *History and Description of the City of Exeter*. Exeter, 1806.
- Jennings, A. C. *Ecclesia Anglicana*. London, 1882.
- Jervis (Pearson), W. H. *The History of France*. London, 1898.
- Jessopp, A. *Norwich*. In *Diocesan Histories*. London, 1884.
- Jewitt, Ll. *The Ballads and Songs of Derbyshire*. London, 1867.
- Jewitt, Ll. and Hope, W. H. St J. *The Corporation Plate and Insignia of Office of the Cities and Towns of England and Wales*. 2 vols. London, 1895.
- Joanne, A. *Dictionnaire géographique et administratif de la France et de ses Colonies*. 7 vols. Paris, 1892-1905.
- *Normandie*. Paris, 1866.
- *Le Nord*. Paris, 1878.
- Johnson, T. F. *Glimpses of Ancient Leicester*. Leicester, 1906.
- Johnson, W. N. *A Handbook of the Collection of Works of Ancient Masters*, published by the Arundel Society. Manchester, 1907.
- Jolimont, T. *Les Principaux Édifices de la Ville de Rouen en 1525*. Rouen, 1845.
- Jollois, J. B. P. *Histoire du Siège d'Orléans*. Paris, 1835.
- Jones, Theophilus (1759-1812). *History of Brecknockshire*. Ed. G. Davies. Brecknock, 1898.
- Jones, W. *Crowns and Coronations*. London, 1883.
- Jones, W. H. *Fasti Ecclesiae Sarisburiensis*. Salisbury, 1879.
- Jonston, J. (1570-1611). *Inscriptiones historicae Regum Scotorum*. Amsterdam, 1602.
- Joret-Descoisières, G. *Un Écrivain national au xv^e siècle (Alain Chartier)*. Paris, 1876.
- Jorga, N. *Philippe de Mézières (1327-1405) et la Croisade au xiv^e siècle*. In *Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études*, Fasc. 110. Paris, 1896.
- Joubert, A. *Documents inédits sur la Guerre de Cent Ans*. Angers, 1890.
- *Les Invasions anglaises en Anjou au xiv^e et xv^e siècles*. Angers, 1872.
- *Étude sur la Vie Privée en Anjou au xv^e siècle*. Angers, 1884.
- *Une Tentative des Anglais contre Château-Gontier en 1421*. Mamers, 1888.
- *Étude sur les comptes de Macé Darne, maître des œuvres de Louis I^{er}, duc d'Anjou*. Angers, 1890.
- Journal des Savants*. Paris, 1816, &c.
- Joursanvault, Baron de, *Catalogue des Archives de*. 2 vols. Paris, 1838.
- [Jurade.] *Registre de la Jurade de Bordeaux (1414-1422)*. In *Archives Municipales de Bordeaux*, vol. iv. Bordeaux, 1883.
- Jusserand, J. J. *Le Roman d'un Roi d'Écosse*. Paris, 1895.
- *Literary History of the English People*. 3 vols. London, 1907.
- *English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages*. Trans. L. T. Smith. London, 1889.
- Justinger, G. (d. c. 1425). *Die Berner Chronik*. Ed. G. Studer. Berne, 1871.
- [Juv.] Jean Juvénal des Ursins (1388-1473). *Histoire de Charles VI*. Ed. J. A. C. Buchon. In *Choix de chroniques et mémoires sur l'histoire de France*, vol. iv. Paris, 1836.

492 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Kabel, P. Die Sage von Heinrich V bis zu Shakespeare. Berlin, 1907. Continued in Palästra, vol. lxix.
- Kaemmerer, L. Hubert und Jean Van Eyck. Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1898.
- Kail, J. (Ed.). Twenty-six Political and other Poems. E.E.T.S. London, 1904.
- [Kal. and Inv.] Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Treasury of H.M. Exchequer. Ed. F. Palgrave. 3 vols. London, 1836.
- Kausler, F. (1794-1848). Synchronistische Uebersicht der Kriegsgeschichte und ihrer gleichzeitischen Quellen. Ulm, 1830.
- Wörterbuch der Schlachten, Belagerungen und Treffen aller Völker. 4 vols. Ulm, 1825-33.
- Keble, J. R. History of the Parish and Manor House of Bishopthorpe. Leeds, 1905.
- Keepe, H. (1652-1685). Monumenta Westmonasteriensia. London, 1682.
- Keightley, T. The Fairy Mythology. London, 1850.
- Kelly, J. F. A History of Spanish Literature. London, 1898.
- Kelly, W. Royal Progresses and Visits to Leicester. Leicester, 1884.
- Kempe, D. A Middle English Tale of Troy. In Englische Studien, vol. xxix. Leipzig, 1901.
- Kenilworth Illustrated, or the History of the Castle, Priory and Church of Kenilworth. Chiswick, 1821.
- Kennet, W. Compleat History of England. 3 vols. London, 1706.
- Kenyon, F. G. Our Bible and the Ancient MSS. London, 1898.
- Kerry, C. A History of the Municipal Church of St Laurence, Reading. Reading, 1883.
- Kervyn de Lettenhove, J. M. B. C. (1817-1891). Histoire de Flandre. 3 vols. Bruges, 1883.
- Relation inédite de la Mort de Jean sans Peur. In Compte Rendu de la Commission royale d'Histoire, ser. III, vol. viii. Brussels, 1866.
- Une nouvelle Relation inédite de la Mort de Jean sans Peur. Ibid. ser. IV, vol. I. Brussels, 1873.
- Richard II est-il mort à Pomfret? In Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences et Belles-Lettres de Belgique, ser. II, vol. xxxiv. Brussels, 1871.
- Keussen, H. Die Matrikel der Universität Köln. Bonn, 1892, &c.
- King, C. Cooper. History of Berkshire. London, 1887.
- Kingsford, C. L. Henry V. New York, 1901.
- Chronicles of London. Oxford, 1905.
- The Early Biographies of Henry V. In Eng. Hist. Rev. vol. xxv. London, 1910.
- The First English Life of Henry V. Oxford, 1911.
- A Legend of Sigismund's visit to England. In Eng. Hist. Rev. vol. xxvi. London, 1911.
- The First Version of Hardyng's Chronicle. In Eng. Hist. Rev. vol. xxvii. London, 1912.
- English Historical Literature in the Fifteenth Century. Oxford, 1913.
- An Historical Collection of the Fifteenth Century. In Eng. Hist. Rev. vol. xxix. London, 1914.
- Prejudice and Promise in 15th Century England. Oxford, 1925.
- Kirby, T. F. Annals of Winchester College. London, 1892.
- The Alien Priory of St Andrew, Hamble, and its Transfer to Winchester College in 1391. In Archaeologia, vol. I. London, 1887.
- Kirk, R. E. G. Life Records of Chaucer. Chaucer Society. London, 1900.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 493

- Kirk, R. E. G. and Furnivall, F. J. Analogues of Chaucer's Canterbury Pilgrimage. Chaucer Society. London, 1903.
- Kitchen, J. Le Court Leete et Court Baron. London, 1623.
- Kitchin, G. W. A History of France. 3 vols. Oxford, 1899.
- The Records of the Northern Convocation. Surtees Society, vol. cxiii. Durham, 1907.
- Kittredge, G. L. On Chaucer's Dream. In Englische Studien, vol. xiii. Heilbronn, 1889.
- Kling, G. (b. 1882). Die Schlacht bei Nicopolis im Jahre 1396. Berlin, 1906.
- Kluge, F. Mittelenglisches Lesebuch. Halle, 1904.
- Knackfuss, H. H. Holbein der jüngere. In Künstlermonographien, vol. xvii. Bielefeld, Leipzig, 1896.
- Knight, C. (1791-1873). Pictorial edition of the Works of Shakespeare. London, 1839.
- Knight, H. G. An Architectural Tour in Normandy. London, 1836.
- Knights Hospitallers in England. Ed. L. B. Larking. Camden Soc. London, 1857.
- Knöpfer, A. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1895.
- Koch, F. Leben und Werke der Christine de Pisan. Goslar, 1885.
- Koenig, W. Zur französischen Litteraturgeschichte Studien und Skizzen. Halle, 1877.
- Kohler, J. Der Ursprung der Melusinsage. Leipzig, 1895.
- Kopp, K. A. Petrus Paulus Vergerius der Aeltere. In Historisches Jahrbuch, vol. xviii. Munich, 1897.
- Korner, H. (c. 1365-1438). Chronica Novella. Ed. J. Schwalm. Göttingen, 1895.
- Krapp, G. P. The Legend of St Patrick's Purgatory. Baltimore, 1900.
- Kraus, F. X. Geschichte der christlichen Kunst. 2 vols. Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1896-1900.
- Kropf, L. L. Pászthói Rátholdi Loórincz Zarándoklása. In Századok, vol. xxx. Budapest, 1896. Also in Catholic Home Annual. New York, 1897.
- Kunze, K. Hanseakten aus England (1275-1412). Halle, 1891.
- Kymer, G. (fl. 1424). Dietarium de sanitatis custodia. In Hearne: Liber Niger Scaccarii. Oxford, 1728.
- La Barre, L. F. J. de. Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de France et de Bourgogne. 2 vols. Paris, 1729.
- Labitte, C. Bataille d'Azincourt. In Revue Anglo-Française, vol. iii. Poitiers, 1835.
- Laborde, A. Les Monuments de la France. 2 vols. Paris, 1816, 1836.
- Paris Municipale. Paris, 1833.
- Laborde, L. E. de. Les Ducs de Bourgogne. 3 vols. Paris, 1849-52.
- Laboureur, J. le (1623-1675). Histoire de Charles VI, Roi de France [translated from Chronique de St Denys]. 2 vols. Paris, 1663.
- Labourt, L. A. Recherches sur l'Origine des Ladreries, Maladreries et Léproseries. Paris, 1854.
- Labroue, E. Le Livre de Vie. Bordeaux, 1891.
- Bergerac sous les Anglais (1379-1382). Bordeaux, 1893.
- Labutte, A. Études historiques sur l'Arrondissement d'Yvetot. Rouen, 1851.
- Lacabane, L. De la Poudre-à-Canon et de son Introduction en France. Paris, 1845.
- Lacaille, H. La Vente de la Baronnie de Courcy. In Bibl. Éc. Chartes, vol. lv. Paris, 1894.
- Lachauvelage, J. Guerres des Français et des Anglais du xi^e au xv^e siècles. 2 vols. Moulins, 1875.

494 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- La Clède, N. de. Histoire générale de Portugal. 2 vols. Paris, 1735.
- La Coudrette (c. 1400). The Romans of Partenay or of Lusignan. Ed. W. W. Skeat. E.E.T.S. London, 1866.
- Lacroix, A. (1793-1875). Épisode du Règne de Jean de Bavière surnommé Jean-sans-Pitié, élu de Liège. Mons, 1841.
- Inventaire des Meubles de l'Hôtel de Guillaume IV, Duc de Bavière, à Paris. Mons, 1842.
- Lacroix, D. Histoire anecdotique du Drapeau Français. Paris, 1876.
- Lacroix, P. (1807-1884). Mœurs, Usages et Costumes du Moyen Age et à l'Époque de la Renaissance. Paris, 1873.
- Lacroix, P. and Seré, F. Le Livre d'or des Métiers. Paris, 1850.
- Lacy, E., bishop successively of Hereford and Exeter (d. 1455), Register of. Ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph. 2 vols. London, 1909.
- Lafenestre, G. L'Exposition des Primitifs Français. Paris, 1904.
- Lafenestre, G. and Richtenberger, E. The National Museum of the Louvre. Trans. B. H. Gausseron. Paris, 1893.
- Laferrière, F. Cours de Droit public et administratif. Paris, 1841.
- Laffetay, J. Mémoire sur les Fondateurs, les Obits et les Sépultures de la Cathédrale de Bayeux. In Bulletin de la Société de Belles-Lettres de Bayeux. Bayeux, 1852.
- La Fons-Mélicocq, J. F. A. Noyon et le Noyonnais au Moyen Age. Noyon, 1841.
- L'Artillerie de la Ville de Lille aux xiv^e, xv^e et xvi^e siècles. Lille, 1854.
- Lalanne, M. L. Chrétien-. Dictionnaire historique de la France. Paris, 1872.
- Recherches sur le Feu Grégeois et sur l'Introduction de la Poudre-à-Canon en Europe. Paris, 1845.
- Lalanne, P. H. de. Fontarabie. Paris, 1896.
- La Marche, Olivier de (1426-1502). Mémoires. Ed. H. Beaune and J. D'Arbaumont. Soc. de l'Hist. de France. 4 vols. Paris, 1883-8.
- Lambarde, W. (1536-1601). Dictionarium Angliæ topographicum. London, 1730.
- Lambert, A. Leprosy Present and Past. In Nineteenth Century, vol. xvi. London, 1884.
- Lambert, N. Recherches historiques sur quelques communes de l'Arrondissement de St Pol. In Le Puits Artésien, vol. iii. St Pol, 1839.
- Lambert de Ballyhier. Compiègne historique et monumental. 2 vols. Compiègne, 1842.
- Lameere, E. Le Grand Conseil des Ducs de Bourgogne de la Maison de Valois. Brussels, 1900.
- Lami, J. Deliciae eruditorum seu veterum ἀνεκδοτων opusculorum collectanea. 16 vols. Florence, 1736-54.
- Lami, S. Dictionnaire des Sculpteurs de l'École Française du Moyen Age au Règne de Louis XIV. Paris, 1898.
- Lamothe. Coutumes du Ressort du Parlement de Guienne. Bordeaux, 1768-9.
- Lamotte, F. de (d. 1687). Antiquitez de la Ville de Harfleur. Havre, 1676. Also ed. E. Lésens. Rouen, 1888.
- La Mure, J. M. de (1616-1675). Histoire des Ducs de Bourbon et des Comtes de Forez. Ed. F. R. Chantelauze. 4 vols. Paris, 1860-97.
- Lancet, The. London, 1823, &c.
- Lang, A. History of Scotland from the Roman Occupation. 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1900-7.

- Lang, A. *The Maid of France*. London, 1908.
- Lang, K. H. (1764-1833). *Geschichte des bairischen Herzogs Ludwig des Bärtigen zu Ingolstadt*. Nürnberg, 1821.
- Langebek, J. (1710-1775). *Scriptores rerum Danicarum*. 9 vols. Copenhagen, 1772-1878.
- Langlois, E. H. (1777-1827). *Notice sur les Bas-Reliefs des Stalles de la Cathédrale de Rouen*. In *Soc. libre d'Émulation de Rouen*, 1827.
- *Essai historique, philosophique et pittoresque sur les Danses des Morts*. 2 vols. Rouen, 1851.
- *Note sur les anciennes Forteresses de Rouen*. In *Soc. libre d'Émulation de Rouen*. Rouen, 1830.
- Langton, W. *Abstracts from Inquisitiones Post Mortem*. Chetham Society. 2 vols. Manchester, 1875, 1886.
- Lannoy, G. (1386-1462). *Œuvres*. Ed. C. Potvin. Louvain, 1878.
- *Survey of Egypt and Syria*. Ed. J. Webb. *Archæologia*, vol. xxi. London, 1827.
- La Quérière, E. de. *Notice historique et descriptive sur l'ancien Hôtel-de-Ville, le Beffroi et la Grosse-Horloge de Rouen*. Rouen, 1864.
- Larchey, E. L. *Origines de l'Artillerie française*. Paris, 1867.
- La Roque, G. A. de (1598-1686). *Histoire généalogique de la Maison d'Harcourt*. 4 vols. Paris, 1662.
- Larousse, P. *Grand Dictionnaire universel du XIX^e siècle*. 15 vols. Paris, 1866-76.
- Larrey, I. de. *Histoire d'Angleterre, d'Écosse, et d'Irlande*. 4 vols. Rotterdam, 1697-1713.
- Lascelles, R. *Liber munerum Hiberniæ (1152-1827)*. 7 parts. London, 1824.
- Lassels, R. (1603-1668). *An Italian Voyage or a Compleat Journey through Italy*. 2 vols. London, 1698.
- Lasteyrie, R. *Les Miniatures d'André Beauneveu et de Jacquemart de Hesdin*. In *Monuments et mémoires publiés par l'Académie des Inscriptions (Fondation Piot)*, vol. iii. Paris, 1890.
- La Thaumassière. *See* Thaumass.
- La Trémoille, C. L. *Les La Trémoille pendant cinq siècles*. 6 vols. Nantes, 1890.
- *Guy de La Trémoille et Marie de Sully. Livre de Comptes (1396-1406)*. Nantes, 1887.
- Laud Troy Book. Ed. J. E. Wülfing. E.E.T.S. 2 vols. London, 1902-3.
- Launoy, J. *Regii Navarrae Gymnasii Parisiensis Historia*. 2 vols. Paris, 1677.
- Laurent, B. et Doinel, J. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives de Carcassonne*. Carcassonne, 1900.
- Lauzun, P. *Les Couvents de la ville d'Agen*. 2 vols. Agen, 1889-93.
- Lavallée, Th. *Histoire des Français*. 2 vols. Paris, 1845.
- *Histoire de Paris*. Paris, 1852.
- *Jean Sans Peur. Scènes historiques*. Paris, 1861.
- Lavillegille, P. A. *Nouail de la. Des anciennes Fourches patibulaires de Montfaucon*. Paris, 1836.
- Lavrotte, C. *Odette de Champdivers à Dijon après la Mort de Charles VI*. In *Mémoires de l'Acad. des Sciences, Arts et Belles-Lettres de Dijon*, ser. II, vol. II. Dijon, 1854.
- Lavisse, E. *Album historique*. Paris, 1897.
- *Études historiques du Moyen Âge*. Paris, 1896.

496 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Lavisse, E. Histoire de France jusqu'à la Révolution. 9 vols. Paris, 1900-11.
 Lavisse, E. and Rambaud, A. Histoire générale du 14^e siècle à nos jours. 12 vols. Paris, 1891-1901.
- Lawson, A. The Kings Quair and the Quare of Jelusy. London, 1910.
- Lay of Agincourt and other Poems. Edinburgh, 1819.
- Leach, A. F. Visitations and Memorials of Southwell Minster. Camden Soc. London, 1891.
 — Memorials of Beverley Minster (1286-1347). Surtees Soc. 2 vols. Durham, 1898-1903.
 — St Paul's School before Colet. In *Archaeologia*, vol. lxii. London, 1910.
 — A History of Winchester College. London, 1899.
- Leader, J. T. and Marcotti, G. Giovanni Acuto. Florence, 1889.
- Le Baud, P. (d. 1505). Cronicques et Ystoires des Bretons. Ed. C. de la Lande de Calan. Rouen, 1907.
- Le Blant, E. Les quatre Mariages de Jacqueline, Duchesse en Bavière. Paris, 1904.
- Lecesne, E. Le Roman de Mélusine. In *Mém. de l'Acad. des Sciences, Lettres et Arts d'Arras*, ser. 11, vol. xix. Arras, 1878.
 — Histoire d'Arras. Arras, 1880.
 — Notice historique, monumentale et statistique sur la Ville d'Arras. Arras, 1872.
- Lechaudé d'Anisy, L. Rotuli Normanniae [5 Hen. V]. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xv. Caen, 1845.
 — Extraits des Chartes et autres Actes Normands qui se trouvent dans les Archives de Calvados. 2 vols. Caen, 1834, 1835.
- Lechler, G. V. Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1873.
- Lecoy de la Marche, A. Le Roi René. 2 vols. Paris, 1875.
 — La Chaire française au Moyen Age. Paris, 1886.
- L'Ecuy, J. B. Essai sur la vie de Jean Gerson. 2 vols. Paris, 1832.
- Ledain, B. Histoire de la Ville de Parthenay. Paris, 1858.
- Lediard, T. Naval History of England. 2 vols. London, 1735.
- Ledieu, A. Inventaire sommaire des Archives municipales: ville d'Abbeville. Abbeville, 1902.
- L'Estrange, A. G. K. Royal Winchester. London, 1889.
 — The Palace and the Hospital, or Chronicles of Greenwich. 2 vols. London, 1886.
- Le Fèvre, Jean, seigneur de St Remy. Chronique. Ed. F. Morand. Soc. de l'Hist. de France. 2 vols. Paris, 1876-81.
- Lefèvre-Pontalis, G. La Guerre de Partisans dans la Haute Normandie (1424-1429). In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vols. liv, lv, lvi, lvii. Paris, 1893-6.
- Lefils, Fl. Histoire civile, politique et religieuse de St Valéry et du Comté du Vimeu. Abbeville, 1858.
- Le Flaguais, J. A. Œuvres poétiques. 4 vols. Caen, 1850-60.
- Lega-Weekes. *See* Weekes.
- Legg, J. W. Missale ad Usus Ecclesiae Westmonasteriensis. Henry Bradshaw Soc. 3 vols. London, 1891-6.
- Legg, L. G. W. English Coronation Records. Westminster, 1901.
- Légrand, A. (d. c. 1644). Les Vies des Saints de la Bretagne Armorique. Quimper, 1901.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 497

- Legrand, H. Paris en 1380. Paris, 1865.
- Le Grand, L. Les Maisons Dieu et Léproseries du Diocèse de Paris. In Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris, vols. xxiv, xxv. Paris, 1897-8.
- Les Maisons Dieu, leur Régime intérieur au Moyen Age. In Revue des Questions Historiques, vol. xix. Paris, 1898.
- Les Quinze Vingts. In Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris, vol. xiii. Paris, 1887.
- Statuts d'Hôtels Dieu et de Léproseries. Paris, 1901.
- Leibnitz, G. W. Codex Juris Gentium Diplomaticus. 2 vols. Hanover, 1693-1700.
- Leicestershire and Rutland Notes and Queries. 3 vols. Leicester, 1889-95.
- Leicestershire Architectural and Archaeological Society. Transactions. Leicester, 1866, &c.
- Le Keux, J. (1783-1846). History and Antiquities of Westminster Abbey. London, 1856.
- Leland, J. (d. 1552). De rebus Britannicis Collectanea. Ed. T. Hearne. 6 vols. London, 1715.
- Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britanniae. Ed. A. Hall. 2 vols. Oxford, 1709.
- Itinerary. Ed. L. T. Smith. 5 vols. London, 1906-10.
- Lelewel, J. Guillebert de Lannoy et ses Voyages en 1413, 1414, 1421. Brussels, 1844.
- Le Marchant, J. (c. 1270). Le Livre des Miracles de N.D. de Chartres. Ed. G. Duplessis. Chartres, 1855.
- Le Mené, J. M. Histoire du Diocèse de Vannes. Vannes, 1888.
- L'Église Cathédrale de Vannes. In Congrès archéologique de France (Vannes), vol. xlvi. Paris, 1881.
- Le Neve, J. (1679-1741). Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae. Ed. T. D. Hardy. 3 vols. Oxford, 1854.
- Lenfant, J. (1661-1728). Histoire du Concile de Pise. 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1724.
- The History of the Council of Constance. Trans. S. Whatley. 2 vols. London, 1730.
- Lenient, C. F. La Poésie patriotique en France au Moyen Age. Paris, 1891.
- Lennel, F. Calais, son Port, son Industrie. Paris, 1908.
- Lenz, M. König Sigismund und Heinrich V von England. Berlin, 1874.
- Drei Tractate aus dem Schriftencycclus des Constanzer Concils. Marburg, 1876.
- Le Petit, F. La Grande Chronique de Hollande, Zélande, Westfrise, Utrecht, Overysse, et Groeningen. 2 vols. Dordrecht, 1691.
- Lépine, E. de, and Merlet, L. Cartulaire de Notre Dame de Chartres. 3 vols. Chartres, 1865.
- Leroux. Histoire de la Ville de Soissons. 2 vols. Soissons, 1839.
- Leroux, A. Nouvelles Recherches Critiques sur les Relations Politiques de la France avec l'Allemagne (1378-1464). Paris, 1892.
- Leroux de Lincy, A. J. V. Recueil de Chants Historiques Français depuis le XII^e jusqu'au XVIII^e siècle. 2 vols. Paris, 1841-2.
- Le Roman de Le Brut. Paris, 1836.
- Nouvelle Bibliothèque bleue, ou Légendes populaires de la France. Paris, 1843.
- Le Roy, O. Étude sur les Mystères. Paris, 1837.
- Lepinasse, R. de. Cartulaire du Prieuré de La-Charité-sur-Loire. Nevers, 1887.
- Letellier, E. La Normandie Monumentale. Havre, 1892.

498 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Lethaby, W. R. *Mediaeval Art from the Peace of the Church to the Eve of the Renaissance*. London, 1904.
- *Westminster Abbey and the King's Craftsmen*. London, 1906.
- *The Palace of Westminster in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. In *Archaeologia*, vol. lx. London, 1906.
- Le Tort, H. (d. after 1523). *Chronique des Évêques et des Comtes de Nevers*. Ed. R. de l'Espinasse. Nevers, 1870.
- Letter Books preserved among the Archives of the City of London*. Ed. R. R. Sharpe. 9 vols. London, 1899, &c.
- Letters and Papers of the reign of Henry VIII*. Ed. J. S. Brewer and J. Gairdner. 21 vols. London, 1861-1910.
- Levallois, J. *Autour de Paris, Promenades Historiques*. Tours, 1884.
- *La Vieille France*. Tours, 1882.
- Le Vasseur, A. *Valeur Historique de la Chronique d'Arthur de Richemont par Guillaume Gruel*. *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vols. xlvii, xlviii. Paris, 1886, 1887.
- Le Verdier, P. *Documents relatifs à la Confrérie de la Passion de Rouen*. In *Soc. de l'Hist. de Normandie, Mélanges*, ser. 1. Rouen, 1891.
- *L'Entrée du Roi Louis XII et de la Reine à Rouen*. Rouen, 1900.
- Lewis, C. T. and Short, C. *Latin Dictionary*. Oxford, 1900.
- Lewis, J. *History of the Church of Faversham*. 1727.
- Lewis, S. *Topographical dictionary*. 4 vols. London, 1831.
- Leyden, Jan van (d. 1504). *Chronicon Hollandiae Comitum et Episcoporum Ultrajectensium*. In F. Sweert, *Rerum Belgicarum Annales*, vol. 1.
- Lhomel, G. *Édits de Police de la Ville de Montreuil-sur-Mer (1419-1519)*. Abbeville, 1903.
- *Le Bailliage Royal de Montreuil-sur-Mer (1360-1790)*. Abbeville, 1903.
- *Le Cartulaire de la Ville de Montreuil-sur-Mer*. Abbeville, 1904.
- Liber Albus*. Ed. H. T. Riley. *R.S.* 2 vols. London, 1859-62. *Trans.* H. T. Riley. London, 1861.
- Liber Custumarum*. Ed. H. T. Riley. *R.S.* 2 vols. London, 1859-62.
- Liber Niger Scaccarii*. Ed. T. Hearne. 2 vols. London, 1721.
- Licquet, F. *Notice sur Alain Blanchard*. In *Précis de l'Académie royale de Rouen*. Rouen, 1828.
- Lincoln's Inn Black Books*. Ed. W. P. Baildon. 4 vols. London, 1897-1902.
- Lindenblatt, J., von der Pusilie. *Jahrbücher oder Chronik*. Königsberg, 1823.
- Lindner, Th. *Deutsche Geschichte unter den Habsburgern und Luxemburgern (1273-1437)*. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1893.
- Lingard, J. (1771-1851). *The History of England to 1688*. 10 vols. London, 1849.
- Lion, J. *Vieil Hesdin*. St Omer, 1857.
- Lipscomb, G. (1773-1846). *History and Antiquities of the County of Buckingham*. 4 vols. London, 1847.
- Literae Cantuarienses*. Ed. J. B. Sheppard. *R.S.* 3 vols. London, 1887-9.
- Little, A. G. *Mediaeval Wales*. London, 1902.
- *The Grey Friars in Oxford*. Oxford Historical Society. Oxford, 1892.
- Littlehales, H. *The Prymer or Prayer Book of the Lay People in the Middle Ages*. 2 vols. London, 1891-2.
- *Chaucer's Pilgrims' Way from London to Canterbury*. London, 1896.
- Littre, M. P. E. *Dictionnaire de la langue française*. 5 vols. Paris, 1863-77.
- Llorrente, T. *Valencia*. 2 vols. Barcelona, 1887-9.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 499

- Lloyd, E. M. *The Herse of Archers at Crécy*. In *Eng. Hist. Rev.* vol. x. London, 1895.
— *A Review of the History of Infantry*. London, 1908.
Lobineau, G. A. (1666–1727). *Histoire de Bretagne*. 2 vols. Paris, 1707.
— *Les Vies des Saints de Bretagne*. 5 vols. Paris, 1836–8.
Loch Cé, *Annals of*. Ed. W. M. Hennessey. R.S. 2 vols. London, 1871.
Locre, F. de (or Locrinus) (1571–1614). *Chronicon Belgicum*. Arras, 1616.
Lodge, E. C. *Serfdom in the Bordelais*. In *Eng. Hist. Rev.* vol. xviii. London, 1903.
— *Gascony under English Rule*. London, 1926.
Lodge, J. (d. 1774). *The Peerage of Ireland*. 7 vols. London, 1789.
Lodge, R. *The Close of the Middle Ages (1273–1494)*. London, 1901.
Lofric, W. J. *Memorials of the Savoy*. London, 1878.
— *The History of London*. 2 vols. London, 1884.
— *The Inns of Court and Chancery*. London, 1895.
Löher, F. *Jakobäa von Bayern und ihre Zeit*. 2 vols. Nördlingen, 1862–9.
— *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Jakobäa von Bayern*. In *Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Königl. Bayerischen Akad. der Wissenschaften*, vol. x. Munich, 1867.
Lollards, The. *Rel. Tract Soc.* London, 1843.
London Magazine, The. London, 1820–9.
Long, H. L. *A Visit to the Battlefields of Cressy and Agincourt*. In *New Monthly Magazine and Humorist*, vols. lxxxiii, lxxxiv. London, 1849.
Longnon, A. *Paris sous la Domination anglaise (1420–1436)*. Paris, 1878.
— *Atlas historique de la France*. Paris, 1885.
— *Les Limites de la France et l'Étendue de la Domination Anglaise à l'Époque de la Mission de Jeanne d'Arc*. Paris, 1875.
— *Entrée de la reine Isabeau et du duc de Bourgogne à Paris*. In *Bull. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. i. Paris, 1874.
Lopes, H. (1617–1694). *L'Église Métropolitaine et Primatiale St André de Bordeaux*. Ed. J. Callon. 2 vols. Bordeaux, 1882.
Loserth, J. *Geschichte des späteren Mittelalters; von 1197–1492*. Munich, 1903.
— *Wiclif and Hus*. Tr. M. J. Evans. London, 1884.
— *Die Kirchliche Reformbewegung in England im xiv Jahrhundert und ihre Aufnahme und Durchführung in Böhmen*. In *Vorträge und Aufsätze aus der Comenius Gesellschaft*. Leipzig, 1893.
Los Rios y Villalta, R. A. de. *Burgos*. 4 vols. Barcelona, 1888–91.
Lot, H. *Des Frais de Justice au xiv^e siècle*. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. xxxiii. Paris, 1872.
Loth, A. *Les Cathédrales de France*. Paris, 1900.
Lottin, D. *Recherches historiques de la Ville d'Orléans*. 3 vols. Orléans, 1836–8.
Louandre, C. L. *Les Arts Somptuaires*. 4 vols. Paris, 1852–8.
Louandre, F. C. *Histoire d'Abbeville et du Comté de Ponthieu*. 2 vols. Paris, 1844–5.
Lounsbury, T. R. *Studies in Chaucer, his life and writings*. 3 vols. London, 1892.
Low, C. R. *Battles of the British Army*. London, 1890.
— *Her Majesty's Navy*. 3 vols. London.
Low, S. J. and Pulling, F. S. *Dictionary of English History*. London, 1897.

500 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Lower, M. A. *A Compendious History of Sussex*. 2 vols. Lewes, 1870.
 — Historical and Genealogical Notices of the Pelham Family. Lewes, 1873.
 Lowth, R. *Life of William of Wykeham*. Oxford, 1777.
 Loyens, H. (1590–1684). *Brevis et succincta synopsis rerum gestarum ab serenissimis Lotharingiae, Brabantiae et Limburgi Ducibus*. Brussels, 1672.
 Lucas, C. P. *West Africa*. In *Historical Geography of the British Colonies*. Oxford, 1900.
 Lucas, E. V. *A Wanderer in London*. London, 1906.
 Luce, S. (1833–1892). *La France pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans*. 2 vols. Paris, 1890–3.
 — *Histoire de Bertrand du Guesclin et de son Époque*. Paris, 1876.
 — *Jeanne d'Arc à Domrémy*. Paris, 1886.
 Luenig, J. C. (1662–1740). *Codex Germaniae Diplomaticus*. 2 vols. Frankfurt, 1732–3.
 Luetzow, Count F. *The Story of Prague*. London, 1902.
 — *The Life and Times of Master John Hus*. London, 1909.
 Luzarche, V. *Lettres historiques des Archives communales de la Ville de Tours*. Tours, 1861.
 Lydgate, J. (c. 1370–1452). *The Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*; transl. from Guillaume de Deguileville. Ed. F. J. Furnivall. E.E.T.S. London, 1899–1901.
 — *The Fall of Princes*. London, 1554.
 — *A Selection from the Minor Poems of*. Ed. J. O. Halliwell. Percy Soc. London, 1840.
 — *The Temple of Glas*. Ed. J. Schick. E.E.T.S. London, 1891.
 — *Troy Book*. Ed. H. Bergen. E.E.T.S. 2 parts. London, 1906–8.
 — *Minor Poems*. Ed. H. N. MacCracken. London, 1911.
 — *The Two Nightingale Poems*. Ed. O. Glauning. E.E.T.S. London, 1900.
 Lydgate, J. and Burgh, B. (d. 1483). *Theories of old Philosophers*. Ed. R. R. Steele. E.E.T.S. London, 1894.
 Lyndwood, W. (c. 1376–1446). *Provinciale seu Constitutiones Angliae*. Oxford, 1679.
 Lysons, D. *Environs of London*. 2 vols. London, 1811.
 Lysons, D. and S. *Magna Britannia*. 6 vols. London, 1806–22.
 Lyte, H. C. Maxwell-. *History of the University of Oxford*. London, 1886.
 — *Dunster and its Lords, 1066–1881*. Exeter, 1882.
 — *Two Chartularies of the Augustinian Priory of Bruton and the Cluniac Priory of Montacute*. Somerset Record Soc. Exeter, 1894.
 — *Catalogue of MSS. and other objects in the Museum of the Public Record Office*. London, 1909.
 — *Historical Notes on the Use of the Great Seal of England*. London, 1926.
 MacCracken, H. N. *The Lydgate Canon*. In *Philological Society's Transactions*. London, 1908.
 — *The Earl of Warwick's Virelai*. In *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, vol. xxvi. Baltimore, 1911.
 MacCulloch, J. R. (1789–1864). *Geographical, Statistical and Historical Dictionary*. 4 vols. London, 1866.
 MacDonald, A. *The Clan Donald*. 2 vols. Inverness, 1896–1900.
 Macfarlane, C. *The Great Battles of the British Army*. London, 1853.
 Macfarlane, C. and Thomson, J. *The Comprehensive History of England*. 4 vols. London, 1876–8.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 501

- Mackenzie, E. An Historical, Topographical and Descriptive View of the County of Northumberland. 2 vols. Newcastle, 1825.
- Mackintosh, J. (1765-1832). History of England. 2 vols. London, 1853.
- Macklin, H. W. The Brasses of England. London, 1907.
- Macquoid, K. S. Through Normandy. London, 1874.
- Macray, W. D. Annals of the Bodleian Library. Oxford, 1890.
- Early Dedications to Englishmen by Foreign Authors and Editors. In *Bibliographia*, vol. i. London, 1895.
- Madden, F. Illuminated Ornaments selected from Manuscripts and early Printed Books. London, 1833.
- Magasin Pittoresque, Le. Paris, 1833, &c.
- Magen, A. (1818-1893). Jurades de la Ville d'Agen (1345-1355). Auch, 1894.
- Mahul, A. J. Cartulaire d'Archives des Communes de l'ancien Diocèse de Carcassonne. 6 vols. Paris, 1857-71.
- Maidstone, C. (c. 1390-1456). Tracts. Ed. Ch. Wordsworth. Henry Bradshaw Society. London, 1894.
- Maiheuw, E. (1570-1625). Sanctissimi Patriarchiae Benedicti Trophæa. 3 pts. Rheims, 1625.
- Maillard, F. Le Gibet de Montfaucon. Paris, 1863.
- Maillard de Chambure, C. (1772-1841). Dijon ancien et moderne. Dijon, 1840.
- Voyage pittoresque en Bourgogne. 2 vols. Dijon, 1833, 1835.
- Maisonobe, A. Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Tarn-et-Garonne. Montauban, 1894, &c.
- Maitland, F. W. Roman Canon Law in the Church of England. London, 1898.
- Maitland, F. W. and Turner, G. F. Year Books of Edward II. 4 vols. Selden Soc. London, 1903-7.
- Maitland, W. (1693-1757). History and Survey of London. London, 1756.
- Maizeroy, P. G. Joly de. Traité sur l'art des Sièges et les Machines des Anciens. Paris, 1778.
- Major (or Mair), J. Historia Majoris Britanniae. Paris, 1521. Edinburgh, 1740.
- Major, R. H. (1818-1891). Life of Prince Henry of Portugal. London, 1868.
- The Discoveries of Prince Henry the Navigator and their Results. London, 1877.
- Malcolm, J. P. Anecdotes of the Manners and Customs of London. London, 1811.
- Malden, A. R. An Official Account of the Battle of Agincourt. In *The Ancestor*, vol. xi. London, 1904.
- Malden, H. E. English Records. A Companion to the History of England. London, 1894.
- The Cely Papers. London, 1900.
- Mâle, E. L'Art religieux du XIII^e siècle en France. Paris, 1902.
- Malo, H. Boulogne-sur-Mer du Moyen Age jusqu'à nos Jours. In *Boulogne-sur-Mer et la Région Boulonnaise*. 2 vols. Boulogne, 1899.
- Malte-Brun, V. A. Histoire de Marcoussis. Paris, 1867.
- Mamerot, S. (d. after 1492). La Chronique Martiniane. Paris, 1502.
- Mancel, G. Le Calvados pittoresque et monumental. Caen, 1847.
- Mander, Carel van (1548-1606). Le Livre des Peintres. Ed. H. Hymans. 2 vols. Paris, 1884, 1885.
- Mandet, F. L'ancien Velay. In A. Michel, vol. iii.
- Mandeville, The Travels of Sir John. Ed. A. W. Pollard. London, 1900.

502 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Manners and Meals in the Olden Times. Ed. F. J. Furnivall. E.E.T.S. London, 1868.
- Manning, J. A. Lives of the Speakers of the House of Commons. London, 1851.
- Manning, O. and Bray, W. History and Topography of the county of Surrey. 3 vols. London, 1804, 1814.
- Mansi, J. D. (1692-1769). Sacrorum Conciliorum nova Collectio. Florence, Venice, Paris, &c., 1757, &c.
- Marchal, A. Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Meuse. Paris, 1875, &c.
- Marchese, V. F. Lives of the most eminent painters, sculptors and architects of the order of S. Dominic. Tr. C. P. Meehan. 2 vols. Dublin, 1852.
- Marco Polo, The Book of. Ed. H. Yule. 2 vols. London, 1871.
- Marcotti. *See* Leader.
- Marcou, P. F. Catalogue raisonné. Palais du Trocadéro. Musée de Sculpture comparée. Paris, 1892.
- Marest, T. (1367-1434), Comptes de. Ed. P. Le Cacheux. Rouen, 1905.
- Margry, P. La Conquête et les Conquéranrs des Îles Canaries. Paris, 1896.
- Mariana, J. de (1537-1624). Historia de Rebus Hispaniae. 4 vols. The Hague, 1733.
- Marineo, L. (b. c. 1460). De rebus Hispaniae memorabilibus. In Rerum Hispanicarum Scriptores, vol. ii. Frankfurt, 1579.
- Marks, A. Tyburn Tree. Its History and Annals. London, 1908.
- Marle, R. van. Un Chancelier de France sous Charles VI: Henry de Marle. Paris, 1910.
- Marleburgh, H. (c. 1421). Chronicle of Ireland (1406-1421). Trans. in Ware, *Historie of Ireland*, part iii. London, 1633.
- Marrier, M. and Du Chesne, A. Bibliotheca Cluniacensis. 2 parts. Paris, 1614.
- Marryat, H. One Year in Sweden. 2 vols. London, 1862.
- Marsden, R. G. The Mythical Town of Orwell. In *Eng. Hist. Rev.* vol. xxi. London, 1906.
- Marshall, E. The Early History of Woodstock Manor and its Environs. Oxford, 1873.
- Marshall, J. The Annals of Tennis. London, 1878.
- Marsy, Comte de. Le Mythe de la Mère Lusine. In *Bulletin Critique*, vol. v. Paris, 1884.
- [Mart. Coll.] Martène, E. and Durand, U. Veterum Scriptorum Collectio Amplissima. 9 vols. 1724-33.
- Martène, E. and Durand, U. Thesaurus Anecdotorum. 5 vols. Paris, 1717.
- Martial de Paris, dit d'Auvergne (1440-1508). Les Vigiles de la Mort du Roy Charles VII. 2 vols. Paris, 1724.
- Martin, A. Histoire de Fécamp. 2 vols. Fécamp, 1893-4.
- Origines du Havre: Histoire de Leure et d'Ingouville. 2 vols. Fécamp, 1882-3.
- Un patriote Cauchois accusé d'Espionnage en 1415. Havre, 1902.
- Histoire du Chef de Caux et de Ste Adresse. Fécamp, 1881.
- Martin, A. and Cahier, Ch. Monographie de la Cathédrale de Bourges. 2 vols. Paris, 1841-4.
- Martin, Henri. Histoire de France. 17 vols. Paris, 1878.
- Martin, Henry. Le Boccace de Jean sans Peur. Brussels, 1911.
- Les Miniaturistes Français. Paris, 1906.

- Martyn, W. *History and Lives of Twenty Kings of England*. Exeter, 1615.
- Mascall, R. (d. 1416). *Registrum*. Ed. J. H. Parry. London, 1917.
- Maskell, W. *Monumenta ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*. 3 vols. Oxford, 1882.
- Mas Latrie, J. M. J. L. de. *Commerce et Expéditions militaires de la France et de Venise au Moyen Age*. In *Collection de Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France. Mélanges Historiques*, vol. iii. Paris, 1880.
- Mason, R. H. *History of Norfolk*. London, 1884.
- Masseville, L. *Le Vasseur de. Histoire sommaire de Normandie*. 6 vols. Rouen, 1691-1704.
- Massiou, D. *Histoire de la Saintonge et de l'Aunis*. 5 vols. Paris, 1836-8.
- Masson, A. L. *Jean Gerson. Sa Vie, son Temps, ses Œuvres*. Lyons, 1894.
- Masson, G. *Mediaeval France*. London, 1888.
- Matthews, J. H. *History of the Parishes of St Yves, Lelant, Towednack and Zennor*. London, 1892.
- Matthews, T. *Welsh Records in Paris*. Carmarthen, 1910.
- Matton, A. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives de l'Hôtel Dieu de Chauny (Aisne)*. Paris, 1866.
- Maulde la Clavière, M. A. R. de. *Histoire de Louis XII*. 6 vols. Paris, 1889-93.
- *Une vieille Ville Normande: Caudebec-en-Caux*. Paris, 1879.
- Maurice, C. E. *Lives of English Popular Leaders in the Middle Ages*. London, 1873.
- Maurice, S. *Richmond Hill*. London, 1807.
- Maxwell, H. *A History of the House of Douglas*. 2 vols. London, 1902.
- Mayo, J. H. *Medals and Decorations of the British Army and Navy*. 2 vols. London, 1897.
- Mazas, A. *Vies des Grands Capitaines français du Moyen Age*. 7 vols. Paris, 1828-9.
- *Cours d'histoire de France*. 4 vols. Paris, 1840.
- Mazure, A. *Tableau historique de l'Auvergne jusqu'au XIV^e siècle*. In *Annales d'Auvergne*, vol. xvii. Clermont-Ferrand, 1844.
- Mazzarosa, A. *Storia di Lucca*. 2 vols. 1833.
- McFadden, F. *Vestiges of Old Southampton*. Southampton, 1891.
- Medical Magazine*. London, 1892, &c.
- Medicis (c. 1475-1565), *Chroniques de*. Ed. A. Chassaing. 2 vols. Le Puy, 1869, 1874.
- Meindre, A. *Histoire de Paris et de son Influence en Europe*. 5 vols. Paris, 1854-5.
- Melsa. *See* Burton, T.
- Melusine. *Revue de Mythologie*. Ed. H. Gaidoz and E. Rolland. 10 vols. Paris, 1878-1901.
- Mély, A. and Bishop, E. *Bibliographie Générale des Inventaires imprimés*. 3 vols. Paris, 1892-5.
- Memorials of Henry V*. Ed. C. A. Cole. R.S. London, 1858.
- Memorials of St Edmund's Abbey*. Ed. T. Arnold. R.S. 3 vols. London, 1890-6.
- Ménagier de Paris*. Ed. J. Pichon. *Soc. des Bibliophiles français*. 2 vols. Paris, 1846-7.
- Ménant, J. *Mémoire sur les Fortifications de Cherbourg par le Maréchal Vauban*. Paris, 1857.
- Ménard, L. (1706-1767). *Histoire civile, ecclésiastique, et littéraire de la Ville de Nîmes*. 7 vols. Nîmes, 1874-5.

504 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Menorval, E. Paris depuis ses Origines jusqu'à nos Jours. 3 vols. Paris, 1889-97.
- Menteith, Red Book of. Ed. W. Fraser. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1880.
- Mercadé, E. (d. 1440). Le Mystère de la Passion. Ed. J. M. Richard. Paris, 1891.
- Merk, C. A History of Dieppe. Paris, 1909.
- Merlet, L. Biographie de Jean de Montaigu. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. xiii. Paris, 1851.
- Merriman, R. B. Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell. 2 vols. Oxford, 1902.
- Métais, C. Cartulaire de l'Abbaye Cardinale de la Trinité de Vendôme. 5 vols. Paris, 1893-7.
- Metz, Guillebert de (d. after 1434). Description de la Ville de Paris au xv^e siècle. Ed. Leroux de Lincy. Paris, 1855.
- Meuillon, G. de (c. 1350-c. 1428), Faits et Gestes de. Ed. E. Maignien. Grenoble, 1897.
- Meung, Jean de (c. 1260-c. 1320). L'Art de Chevalerie. Ed. U. Robert. Soc. des Anciens Textes français. Paris, 1897.
- Meunier, F. Essai sur la Vie et les Œuvres de Nichole Oresme. Paris, 1857.
- Meuse. *See* Marchal.
- Meyer, J. (1491-1552). Commentarii sive Annales rerum Flandricarum. Antwerp, 1561.
- Meyer, P. L'Entrevue d'Ardres. In *Ann. Bull. Soc. de l'Hist. de France*, vol. xviii. Paris, 1881.
- Meyrick, S. R. (1783-1848). Ancient Armour. 5 vols. London, 1824-30.
- Heraldic visitations of Wales. By Lewys Dwnn or Doune. 2 vols. Llan-doverly, 1846.
- Mézeray, F. E. de. Histoire de France. 3 vols. Paris, 1643-51.
- Michel, A. L'Ancienne Auvergne et le Velay. 4 vols. Moulins, 1843-4.
- Michel, F. Les Écossais en France. 2 vols. London, 1862.
- Rapport sur les anciens monuments de l'Histoire et de la Littérature de la France qui se trouvent dans les Bibliothèques de l'Angleterre. Paris, 1838.
- Michelet, J. (1798-1874). Histoire de France. 19 vols. Paris, 1876-8.
- Michelin, L. Essais historiques et statistiques sur le Département de Seine-et-Marne. 6 parts. Melun, 1841.
- Michiels, J. A. X. Histoire des Peintres. École Flamande. Paris, 1864.
- Mieris, F. van (1689-1763). Groot Charterboek der Graven van Holland, van Zeeland, en Heeren van Vriesland. 4 vols. Leyden, 1753-6.
- Millar, J. H. A Literary History of Scotland. London, 1903.
- Millin de Grandmaison, A. L. Antiquités Nationales. 5 vols. Paris, 1790-9.
- Milman, H. H. (1791-1868). History of Latin Christianity. 9 vols. London, 1868.
- Annals of St Paul's Cathedral. London, 1868.
- Milner, J. (1752-1826). History and Survey of the Antiquities of Winchester. 2 vols. Winchester, 1798-1801.
- An Historical and Critical Inquiry into the Existence and Character of St George. London, 1792.
- Minsheu, J. (d. after 1617). Ductor in Linguas. London, 1617.
- Miræus (i.e. Le Mire, A.) (1573-1640). Rerum Belgicarum Chronicon. Antwerp, 1636.
- Mirk or Myrc, J. Instructions for Parish Priests. Ed. E. Peacock. E.E.T.S. London, 1868.

- Mirot, L. Les Insurrections urbaines au Début du Règne de Charles VI. Paris, 1906.
- Le Procès de Maître Jean Fusoris Chanoine de Notre Dame de Paris (1415-1416). In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. xxvii. Paris, 1901.
- Un Trousseau Royal à la Fin du xiv^e siècle. *Ibid.* vol. xxix. Paris, 1902.
- Isabelle de France, Reine d'Angleterre, Comtesse d'Angoulême, Duchesse d'Orléans (1389-1409). In *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, années xviii, xix. Paris, 1904-5.
- Le Procès du boiteux d'Orgemont. In *Moyen Age*, ser. II, vols. xiv, xv. Paris, 1910, 1911.
- Paiements et Quittances de Travaux exécutés sous le règne de Charles VI. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. lxxxi. Paris, 1920.
- Dom Bévy et les comptes des trésoriers des guerres. *Ibid.* vol. lxxxvi. Paris, 1925.
- Mirot, L. and Déprez, E. Les Ambassades anglaises pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans (1327-1450). In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vols. lix-lxi. Paris, 1898-1900.
- Mirror for Magistrates. Ed. J. Haslewood. 3 vols. London, 1815.
- Miscellanea Genealogica et Heraldica. *See* Howard, J. J.
- Misyn, R. (d. c. 1462). The Fire of Love, and the Mending of Life or the Rule of Living. Transl. from Richard Rolle of Hampole. Ed. R. Harvey. E.E.T.S. London, 1896.
- Moberly, G. H. Life of William of Wykeham. Winchester, 1893.
- Moke, H. G. (1803-1862). Histoire de la Belgique. Brussels, 1881.
- Molanden, Boucher de. Jacques Boucher sieur de Guilleville et de Mézières. In *Mém. de la Soc. archéologique et historique de l'Orléanais*, vol. xxiii. Orléans, 1889.
- Molinier, A. Les Sources de l'histoire de France. 6 vols. Paris, 1901-6.
- Molinier, C. L'Inquisition dans le Midi de la France au xiii^e et au xiv^e siècles. Paris, 1880.
- Mombert, J. I. English Versions of the Bible. London, 1907.
- Monasticon Anglicanum. *See* Dugdale, W.
- Monfar y Sors, D. Historia de los Condes de Urgel. 2 vols. Barcelona, 1853.
- Monget, C. La Chartreuse de Dijon. 2 vols. Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1898, 1900.
- Monlezun, J. J. (1800-1859). Histoire de la Gascogne. 6 vols. Auch, 1846-50.
- Monnier, P. Le Quattrocento. 2 vols. Paris, 1901.
- Monson, W. (1569-1643). Naval Tracts. Ed. M. Oppenheim. 2 vols. London, 1902.
- Monstier, A. du (1607-1662). Neustria Pia: seu de omnibus et singulis Abbatiiis et Prioratibus totius Normanniae. Ed. J. Gallemant. Rouen, 1663.
- Monstrelet, Enguerrand de (c. 1390-1453). Chronique. Paris, 1603.
- (In vol. iii.) Ed. L. Douët d'Arcq. *Soc. Hist. France*. 6 vols. Paris, 1857-62.
- Montagnac, E. de. Les Ardennes. 2 vols. Paris, 1874.
- Montandré, Le Combat de (May 19, 1402). La Rochelle, 1898.
- Montégut, E. Souvenirs de Bourgogne. Paris, 1886.
- Montfaucon, B. L'Antiquité Expliquée. 10 vols. Paris, 1719-24.
- Les Monuments de la Monarchie Française. 5 vols. Paris, 1729-33.
- Montgomery, H. H. History of Kennington and its Neighbourhood. London, 1889.
- Montgomeryshire Collections. Powysland Club. London, 1867, &c.
- Month, The. London, 1864, &c.

506 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Montille, L. de. *Les Armes de Bourgogne et du Chancelier Robin à l'Hôtel Dieu de Beaune*. In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist., de l'Archéologie et de Littérature de Beaune*. Beaune, 1879.
- Montreuil, J. de (1354-1418). *Epistolae Selectae*. In Martène, *Collectio*, vol. ii.
- Mont-St-Michel, *Chronique du (1343-1468)*. Ed. S. Luce. 2 vols. Paris, 1879.
- Monumenta Franciscana. Ed. J. S. Brewer and R. Howlett. *R.S.* 2 vols. London, 1858, 1882.
- Monumental Brass Society. *Transactions*. Cambridge and London, 1887-1914.
- Moore, A. W. *A History of the Isle of Man*. 2 vols. London, 1900.
- Moore, N. *The History of the Study of Medicine in the British Isles*. Oxford, 1908.
- *The Book of the Foundation of St Bartholomew's Church in London*. London, 1886.
- Moore, T. *The History of Ireland*. 4 vols. London, 1835.
- Morant, P. *History of Essex*. 2 vols. London, 1768.
- Moranvillé, C. *Rémontrances de l'Université et de la Ville de Paris à Charles VI sur le Gouvernement du Royaume*. *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. li. Paris, 1890.
- Moranvillé, H. *Extraits des Journaux du Trésor (1345-1419)*. *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. xlix. Paris, 1888.
- Morice, P. H. *Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Bretagne*. 2 vols. Paris, 1750-6.
- *Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'Histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Bretagne*. 3 vols. Paris, 1742-6.
- Morillot, L. *La Question des Restes de Jean sans Peur*. Dijon, 1905.
- Morin, L. R. *Histoire de Louviers*. 2 parts. Rouen, 1822.
- Morlent, J. *Le Havre ancien et moderne*. 2 vols. Havre, 1825.
- *Voyage historique et pittoresque de Havre à Rouen*. Rouen, 1836.
- *Le Havre et son Arrondissement*. Havre, 1841.
- *Le Cap de la Hève, Eva de Vitaval ou l'Écharpe d'Azur*. Havre, 1861.
- Morley, H. *English Writers*. 8 vols. London, 1887-92.
- Morosini, Antonio (b. c. 1357). *Chronique. Extraits relatifs à l'Histoire de France*. Ed. G. Lefèvre-Pontalis. *Soc. de l'Hist. de France*. 4 vols. Paris, 1898-1902.
- Morris, J. E. *The Welsh Wars of Edward I*. Oxford, 1901.
- *The Archers at Crécy*. In *Eng. Hist. Rev.* vol. xii. London, 1897.
- Morris, J. E. and Jordan, H. *An Introduction to the Study of Local History and Antiquities*. London, 1910.
- Mouillard, J. M. *Vie de St Vincent Ferrier*. Vannes, 1856.
- Moule, T. (1781-1851) and Harding, G. P. (d. 1853). *Antiquities in Westminster Abbey*. London, 1825.
- Mowat, R. B. *Henry V*. London, 1919.
- Moyen Age*, Le. Paris, 1888, &c.
- Muentz, E. *Claus Sluter et la Sculpture franco-flamande au xv^e siècle*. In *Magasin Pittoresque*, ser. II, vol. vii. Paris, 1889.
- Munier-Jolain, J. *Vieux avocats, vieux procès*. Paris, 1879.
- Munimenta Academica*. Ed. H. Anstey. *R.S.* 2 vols. London, 1868.
- Münster, S. (1489-1552). *Cosmographia*. Basle, 1545.
- Muratorì, L. A. (1672-1750). *Scriptores Rerum Italicarum*. 27 vols. Milan, 1723, &c.
- Murray, J. *Handbook for Travellers in Worcestershire and Herefordshire*. London, 1894.
- Murray, J. A. H. *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*. Oxford, 1888, &c.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 507

- Murray-Smith, A. *The Roll-Call of Westminster Abbey*. London, 1902.
- Musgrave, G. M. (1798-1853). *By-roads and Battlefields in Picardy*. London, 1861.
- *A Ramble through Normandy*. London, 1855.
- Myroure of Oure Ladye. Ed. J. M. Blunt. E.E.T.S. London, 1873.
- Nagerel, J. *L'Histoire et Chronique de Normandie*. Rouen, 1589.
- Nomeche, A. J. *Histoire Nationale*. 4 vols. Louvain, 1879-82.
- *Jean IV et la Fondation de l'Université de Louvain*. Louvain, 1888.
- Napier, H. A. *Historical Notices of the Parishes of Swyncombe and Ewelme*. Oxford, 1858.
- Nares, R. *A Glossary of words, phrases, &c. in the works of English authors*. Ed. J. O. Halliwell and T. Wright. London, 1905.
- Nash, T. R. *History of Worcestershire*. 2 vols. London, 1781.
- Nasmith, J. *Itineraria Symonis Simeonis et Willelmi de Worcestre*. Cambridge, 1778.
- Nauclerus, J. (1430-1510). *Memorabilium omnis aetatis et omnium gentium Chronici commentarii*. Tübingen. 2 vols. 1516.
- Navarrete, A. *Historia maritima militar de España*. Madrid, 1901.
- Neade, W. (c. 1625). *The Double Armed Man*. London, 1625.
- Neale, J. M. (1818-1866). *Mediaeval Preachers and Mediaeval Preaching*. London, 1856.
- *Illustrations of Monumental Brasses*. Cambridge Camden Society. Cambridge, 1846.
- Neale, J. P. *The History and Antiquities of Westminster Abbey*. London, 1856.
- Neale, J. P. and Brayley, E. W. *History of the Abbey Church of St Peter's, Westminster*. 2 vols. London, 1818.
- Netherclift, J. *Autographs of the Kings and Queens and Eminent Men of Great Britain*. London, 1835.
- Netter, T., of Walden. *Doctrinale Fidei Ecclesiae*. 3 vols. Venice, 1571. Also ed. B. Blanciotti. 3 vols. Venice, 1757-9.
- Neuville, D. *Le Parlement royal à Poitiers (1418-1436)*. In *Revue historique*, vol. vi. Paris, 1878.
- *État sommaire des Archives de la Marine antérieures à la Révolution*. Paris, 1898.
- Newcourt, R. *Repertorium Ecclesiasticum*. 2 vols. London, 1708.
- Newhall, R. A. *The English Conquest of Normandy, 1416-1424*. New Haven, 1924.
- Newman, G. *On the History of the Decline and final Extinction of Leprosy in the British Islands*. London, 1895.
- Newman, W. L. *The Correspondence of Humphrey Duke of Gloucester and Pier Candido Decembri*. In *Eng. Hist. Rev.* vols. xix, xx. London, 1904, 1905.
- Nichols, J. (1745-1826). *History of the County of Leicester*. 4 vols. London, 1795-1811.
- *Six Old Plays*. 2 vols. London, 1779.
- *The Progress and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*. 4 vols. London, 1788-1821.
- *Bibliotheca Topographica Britannica (with continuation entitled "Miscellaneous Antiquities")*. 10 vols. London, 1780-1800.
- Nichols, J. G. (1806-1873). *An original appointment of Sir John Fastolfe to be Keeper of the Bastille of St Anthony at Paris, 1421*. In *Archaeologia*, vol. xlv. London, 1873.

508 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Nichols, J. G. (1806–1873). *Observations on the Heraldic Devices on the Effigies of Richard II and his Queen in Westminster Abbey*. In *Archæologia*, vol. xxix. London, 1842.
- *Autographs of Royal and Noble Personages in English History*. London, 1829.
- See *Collectanea Topographica et Genealogica*.
- Nicolas, N. H. (1799–1848). *History of the Battle of Agincourt*. 2 parts. London, 1832.
- *The Chronology of History*. London, 1833.
- *History of the Orders of Knighthood*. 4 vols. London, 1842.
- *Life of Chaucer*. In *Aldine Edition of Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, vol. i. London, 1845.
- *History of the Royal Navy*. 2 vols. London, 1847.
- Nicolson, J. and Burn, R. *History and Antiquities of the Counties of Westmorland and Cumberland*. 2 vols. London, 1777.
- Niem, Th. de (1340–1418). *De Scismate*. Ed. G. Erler. Leipzig, 1890.
- *Vita Papae Johannis XXIII*. In H. Meibom, *Rerum Germanicarum* tomi III, vol. i. Helmstadt, 1688.
- Niethe, J. F. W. *Die Schlacht bei Agincourt*. Berlin, 1906.
- Nitsch, K. W. (1818–1880). *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1883–5.
- [Noblesse.] *Boke of Noblesse, addressed to King Edward IV on his Invasion of France in 1475*. Ed. J. G. Nichols. Roxburghe Club. London, 1860.
- Noces, B. (d. after 1395), *Registre de*. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. lii. Paris, 1891.
- Nodier, C. *Voyage pittoresque et romantique dans l'ancienne France*. 17 vols. Paris, 1835, &c.
- Noel, A. *Souvenirs pittoresques de la Touraine*. Paris, 1824.
- Noel, H. *John Wycliffe. His Life, Times and Followers*. London, 1866.
- Noorthouck, J. *A New History of London including Westminster and Southwark*. London, 1773.
- Nordenskjöld, N. A. E. *Periplus. An Essay on the Early History of Charts and Sailing Directions*. Ed. F. A. Bather. Stockholm, 1897.
- Norgate, K. *England under the Angevin Kings*. 2 vols. London, 1887.
- [Norm. Chron.] *Chronique de Normandie*. Ed. B. Williams. In *Gesta Henrici Quinti*. Also ed. as “*Les Cronicques de Normandie*” by A. Hellot. Rouen, 1881.
- Normandie Monumentale et Pittoresque (Seine-Inférieure). Havre, 1893.
- Northern Convocation, *Records of the*. Ed. G. W. Kitchin. Surtees Soc. Durham, 1907.
- Notes and Queries*. London, 1850, &c.
- [Nott. Rec.] *Records of the Borough of Nottingham*. 4 vols. London, 1882–9.
- Nouvelle Biographie Générale*. 46 vols. Paris, 1852, &c.
- [Nouv. Rev.] *Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger*. Paris, 1876, &c.
- Novilleau, P. *La Chapelle de Notre Dame du Chevet en la Basilique de St Martin, et la Famille La Meingre Boucicaut (1363–1490)*. In *Bull. Soc. Archéologique de Touraine*, vol. ii. Tours, 1872.
- Noyes, T. H. *Roll of a Subsidy levied in 13 Henry IV as far as relating to the County of Sussex*. In *Sussex Archæol. Coll.* vol. x. London, 1858.
- Numismatic Chronicle*. London, 1836, &c.
- Nürnberg Chroniken*. In *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1862.

- Ocland, C. (d. c. 1590). *Anglorum Proelia*. London, 1582.
- O'Connor, D. *St Patrick's Purgatory*. Dublin, 1895.
- Odolant-Desnos, P. J. (1722-1801). *Chronologie historique des grands Baillis du Comté et Duché d'Alençon*. Ed. E. F. Courtilloles. Paris, 1872.
- *Mémoires historiques sur la Ville d'Alençon et ses Seigneurs*. 2 vols. Alençon, 1787.
- O'Flanagan, R. *Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Privy Seal of Ireland*. 2 vols. London, 1870.
- Olden, T. *The Church of Ireland*. London, 1892.
- Oliver, G. (1781-1861). *History of the City of Exeter*. Exeter, 1861.
- *Monasticon Diocesis Exoniensis*. London, 1846.
- *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter*. Exeter, 1861.
- Ollard, S. L. and Crosse, G. *A Dictionary of English Church History*. London, 1912.
- Ollier, E. *Essai sur la Coqueluche*. Montpellier, 1835.
- Oman, C. W. C. *A History of the Art of War in the Middle Ages*. London, 1898.
- Second edition. 2 vols. London, 1924.
- *A History of England*. London, 1895.
- *England and the Hundred Years' War*. London, 1898.
- *The History of England from the Accession of Richard II to the Death of Richard III (1377-1485)*. London, 1906.
- *Warwick the Kingmaker*. London, 1891.
- Omont, H. *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits Français*. Paris, 1895, &c.
- *Antiquités et Guerres de Juifs de Josèphe*. Paris, 1906.
- *Livre de Merveilles*. Paris, 1907.
- Oppenheim, M. *A History of the Administration of the Royal Navy, and of Merchant Shipping in Relation to the Navy*. London, 1896.
- *Naval Accounts and Inventories of the Reign of Henry VII*. London, 1896.
- Oppolzer, Th. *Canon der Finsternisse*. Vienna, 1887.
- [Ord. Priv. Co.] *Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council of England*. Ed. N. H. Nicolas. 7 vols. London, 1834.
- Ordish, T. F. *Shakespeare's London*. London, 1897.
- Ordonnances des Rois de France de la Troisième Race*. 22 vols. Paris, 1733-1847.
- Original Letters Illustrative of English History*. Ed. H. Ellis. 3 series. London, 1824-46.
- Ormerod, G. *History of Cheshire*. 3 vols. London, 1819.
- Orthographia Gallica*. Ed. J. Stürzinger. Heilbronn, 1884.
- Orville, Maurey d'. *Recherches historiques sur la Ville, les Évêques et la Diocèse de Séez*. Sées, 1829.
- O'Sullivan, P. (1590-c. 1660). *Historiae Catholicae Iberniae compendium*. Ed. M. Kelly. Dublin, 1850.
- Othonis et Ottoboni Cardinalium *Constitutiones legatinae*. In *Lyndwood, Provinciale*.
- Otterbourne, Thos. *Chronica Regum Angliae*. Ed. T. Hearne. Oxford, 1732.
- Oudin, R. C. (1638-1717). *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1722.
- Overall, W. H. *Some Particulars as to the Early Maps of London*. In *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries*. London, 1873.
- Owen, H. and Blakeway, J. B. *History of Shrewsbury*. 2 vols. London, 1825.

510 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Oxenford, J. *The Illustrated Book of French Songs*. London, 1877.
 [P.D.L.] *Description Archéologique des Saintes Chapelles de l'Auvergne*. By P. D. L. Clermont-Ferrand, 1864.
- [P. Plo.] *The Vision of William concerning Piers Plowman*. Ed. W. W. Skeat. E.E.T.S. 4 vols. London, 1867-85.
- Page, J. (fl. 1418). *The Siege of Rouen*. In *Historical Collections of a London Citizen*. Ed. J. Gairdner. Camden Soc. London, 1876. Also Ed. J. Conybeare in *Archæologia*, vol. xxi, and F. Madden in *Archæologia*, vol. xxii. London, 1827, 1829.
- Page, W. *The Certificates of the Commissioners appointed to survey the Chantries, guilds, hospitals, &c. in the County of York*. Surtees Soc. 2 vols. Durham, 1894-5.
- Pajot, L. *La Marine militante du Ponant entre 1364 et 1374*. In *Positions des Thèses de l'École des Chartes*. Paris, 1877.
- Palacky, F. *Documenta Mag. Johannis Hus vitam illustrantia (1403-1418)*. Prague, 1869.
- Palæographical Society. *Facsimiles of Manuscripts and Inscriptions*, ser. 1, II. London, 1873-94.
- Palaestra. Berlin, 1898, &c.
- Palgrave, F. *The History of Normandy and England*. 4 vols. London, 1851-64.
- Pall Mall Gazette. London, 1865, &c.
- Palmer, C. F. R. *Fasti Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum*. In *Archæological Journal*, vol. xxxv. London, 1878.
- *The Black Friars of Yarm*. *Ibid.* vol. xxxvii. London, 1880.
- *The Black Friars of York*. In *The Reliquary*, October, 1885.
- Pannier, L. (d. 1875). *La Noble Maison de St Ouen*. Paris, 1872.
- *Les Joyaux du Duc de Guienne*. In *Revue Archéologique*, vols. xxvi, xxvii. Paris, 1873-4.
- Panormita (Antonio Beccadelli, 1394-1471). *De dictis et factis Alfonsi regis Aragonum et Neapolis Libri quatuor*. Wittenberg, 1585.
- Pantin, W. A. *The General and Provincial Chapters of the English Black Monks (1215-1540)*. In *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. iv, vol. x. London, 1927.
- Papal Letters. *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland*. Ed. W. H. Bliss and J. A. Twemlow. London, 1893, &c.
- Paquot, J. N. (1722-1803). *Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire littéraire des Pays-Bas*. 3 vols. Louvain, 1765-70.
- Paradin, C. *Devises Héroïques*. Lyons, 1557.
- Paradin, G. (1510-1590). *Annales de Bourgogne*. Lyons, 1566.
- Paré, A. (1509-1590). *Œuvres complètes*. Ed. J. F. Malgaigne. 3 vols. Paris, 1840-1.
- Paris, G. (1839-1903). *La Littérature française au Moyen Age*. Paris, 1890.
- *Esquisse historique de la Littérature française au Moyen Age*. Paris, 1907.
- Paris, Matthew (c. 1200-1259). *Historia Anglorum sive Historia minor*. Ed. F. Madden. R.S. 3 vols. London, 1866-9.
- Parker, J. H. *Some Remarks upon the Church of Fotheringhay*. Oxford, 1841.
- Parker, M. (1504-1575). *De Antiquitate Britannicæ Ecclesiæ historia*. Hanover, 1605.

- Parker, M. (1504-1575). *Historia Brevis Thomae Walsingham*. London, 1574.
- Parkes-Belloc, B. *La Belle France*. London, 1868.
- Parton, J. *Some Account of the Hospital and Parish of St Giles'in-the-Fields*. London, 1822.
- [Pas-de-Calais.] *Dictionnaire historique et archéologique du Département de Pas-de-Calais*. 14 vols. Arras, 1875-83.
- Pasquier, E. *Les recherches de la France*. Paris, 1665.
- Paston Letters. Ed. J. Gairdner. 4 vols. Westminster, 1900-1.
- Pastoralet, Le. A poem written after the death of Henry V. In *Brands*, vol. ii.
- Pattison, Mrs Mark. *The Renaissance of Art in France*. 2 vols. London, 1879.
- Paues, A. C. *A Fourteenth Century English Biblical Version*. Cambridge, 1904.
- Paulet, L. *Les Légendes du Château de Ham*. In *La Picardie*, vols. v, vi. Amiens, 1859.
- Pauli, R. (1823-1882). *Bilder aus Alt-England*. Gotha, 1876. Trans. by E. C. Otté. London, 1861.
- *Geschichte von England*. 3 vols. Hamburg and Gotha, 1853-8.
- Pauli, R. and Hertzberg, W. *The Libell of Englishe Polycye*. Leipzig, 1878.
- Pauwels, Th. (1416-after 1485). *De Rebus actis sub Ducibus Burgundiae Compendium*. Ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove. In *Chroniques relatives à l'Histoire de la Belgique sous la Domination des Ducs de Bourgogne*, vol. iii. Brussels, 1876.
- [Pays-Bas.] *Chronique des Pays-Bas, de France, d'Angleterre et de Tournai (1294-1458)*. Ed. J. J. Smet. In *Recueil des Chroniques de Flandre*, vol. iii. Brussels, 1856.
- Péchenard, P. L. *Jean Juvénal des Ursins*. Paris, 1876.
- Pecock, R. (c. 1395-c. 1460). *The Repressor of Overmuch Blaming of the Clergy*. Ed. C. Babington. R.S. 2 vols. London, 1860.
- *The Reule of Crysten Religioun*. Ed. J. Gairdner. London, 1911.
- Pedrick, G. *Monastic Seals of the 13th Century*. London, 1902.
- *Borough Seals of the Gothic Period*. London, 1904.
- Penguilly l'Haridon, O. de. *Catalogue des Collections du Cabinet d'Armes de sa Majesté l'Empereur*. Paris, 1867.
- Pennant, T. (1726-1798). *A Tour in Wales*. 2 vols. London, 1784.
- *Some Account of London*. London, 1793.
- Percy, T. (1729-1811). *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*. Ed. H. B. Wheatley. 3 vols. London, 1876.
- *The Hermit of Warkworth*. London, 1791.
- Pereira, Nuno Alvares de (1360-1431). *Chronica*. Oporto, 1848.
- Périaux, N. *Histoire sommaire et chronologique de la Ville de Rouen*. Rouen, 1874.
- *Dictionnaire Indicateur et historique des Rues et Places de Rouen*. Rouen, 1870.
- Perillos, Raymond de (d. after 1416). *Visits to St Patrick's Purgatory, 1397*. In *Mém. de la Soc. Archéologique du Midi de la France*, vol. i. Toulouse, 1834.
- Perkins, J. H. T. *The Coronation Book*. London, 1892.
- Pérouse, G. *Étude sur l'Origine de la Gabelle et sur son Organisation jusqu'en 1380*. Positions des Thèses de l'École des Chartes. Toulouse, 1898.
- Perrens, F. T. *La Démocratie en France au Moyen Age*. 2 vols. Paris, 1875.
- Perret, P. M. *Histoire des Relations de la France avec Venise du xiii^e siècle à l'Avènement de Charles VIII*. 2 vols. Paris, 1896.

512 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Perrin. Notice historique sur Alain Blanchard. In Soc. libre d'Émulation de Rouen. Rouen, 1828.
- Persona (or Person), Gobelinus (b. 1358). Cosmodromius. Ed. M. Jansen. Münster, 1900.
- Petegreu fro William Conquerour of the Crowne of England lynnyally descendyng unto Kyng Henry the VI. In Robert of Gloucester's Chronicle. Ed. T. Hearne. 2 vols. Oxford, 1724.
- [Peter. Chron.] Chronicle in Peterhouse Library, Cambridge, from 1157 to 1461. In Leland, *Collectanea*, vol. ii.
- Pétigny, J. (1801-1858). Charte inédite et secrète de la Reine Isabelle de Bavière. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. x. Paris, 1849.
- Petit, E. Histoire des Ducs de Bourgogne de la Race Capétienne. 8 vols. Paris, 1885-1903.
- Petit, J. (b. c. 1350-1411). Le Livre du Champ d'Or et autres Poèmes inédits. Ed. P. Le Verdier. Société Rouennaise de Bibliophiles. Rouen, 1895.
- Nobles et Vilains. Les Prouesses des Martels. Ed. A. Hellot. Paris, 1894.
- Petit de Julleville, L. Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature française. 8 vols. Paris, 1896-9.
- Petite Chronique de Guienne. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. xlvii. Paris, 1886.
- Petitot, C. B. (1772-1823). Tableau du règne de Charles VI. In *Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de France*, vol. vi. Paris, 1825.
- Petreius, Th. (1567-1640). *Bibliotheca Carthusiana*. Cologne, 1609.
- Pez, H. *Scriptores rerum Austriacarum*. 3 vols. Vienna, &c., 1743-5.
- Pezet, R. A. L. Recherches historiques sur la Naissance et la Parenté d'Alain, Jean et Guillaume Chartier. In *Soc. d'Agriculture, Sciences, Arts et Belles-Lettres de Bayeux, Bulletin*, Bayeux, 1850.
- Pfister, C. Histoire de Nancy. Nancy, 1902.
- Philological Society. *Transactions*. London, 1854, &c.
- Piaget, A. La Cour Amoureuse dite de Charles VI. In *Romania*, vols. xx, xxi. Paris, 1891, 1902.
- Le Miroir aux dames. Poème inédit du xv^e siècle. Neuchâtel, 1908.
- Ballades de Guillebert de Lannoy et de Jean de Werchin. In *Romania*, vol. xxxix. Paris, 1910.
- Picardie, La, *Revue littéraire et scientifique*. Amiens, 1855, &c.
- Picot, A. E. Catalogue du cabinet des livres de Chantilly. Paris, 1890.
- Picot, G. M. R. Histoire des États Généraux. 4 vols. Paris, 1872.
- Documents relatifs aux États Généraux sous Philippe le Bel. Paris, 1891.
- Piers, H. B. Histoire de la Ville de Théroouanne. St Omer, 1833.
- Azincourt. In *La Puits Artésien*, vol. i. St Pol, 1837.
- Piferrer, P. and Pi y Margall, F. *Cataluña*. Barcelona, 1884, &c.
- Pigeotte, L. Les anciens seigneurs de Beaufort. Troyes, 1881.
- Pilham, Sieur de. Histoire du Maréchal de Boucicaut. Paris, 1697.
- Pilotelle, M. Notice sur le Donjon de Maubergeon. In *Bulletin de la Soc. des Antiquaires de l'Ouest*, ser. ix. Poitiers, 1860.
- Pina, Ruy de (d. 1519). *Chronica do Senhor Rey D. Duarte y Alfonso V*. In *Colleccão de livros ineditos de Historia Portugueza*, vol. i. Lisbon, 1790.
- Pingone, E. F. (1525-1582). *Augustae Taurinorum Chronica*. In J. G. Graevius, *Thesaurus Antiquitatum et Historiarum Italiae*, vol. ix, pt. 6. Lyons, 1723.

- Pinkerton, J. *Iconographia Scotica, or Portraits of Illustrious Persons of Scotland*. London, 1797.
- Pipe Rolls, Introduction to the study of the. Pipe Roll Society. Vol. iii. London, 1884.
- Pirala, A. *Provincias Vascongadas*. Barcelona, 1885.
- Pisano, M. (d. after 1460). *Gesta illustrissimi regis Johannis de bello Septensi*. Ed. J. Correa da Serra. Lisbon, 1790.
- Piton, C. *Histoire de Paris. Le Quartier des Halles*. Paris, 1891.
- Pitré-Chevalier, P. *La Bretagne ancienne et moderne*. 2 vols. Paris, 1859, 1860.
- Pits, J. (1560-1616). *Relationes Historicae de rebus Anglicis*. Paris, 1619.
- Planché, J. R. *The Conqueror and His Companions*. 2 vols. London, 1874.
- *Monuments of the Cockayne Family in Ashbourne Church, Derbyshire*. In *Journal of the British Archæological Association*, vol. vii. London, 1852.
- Planchenault, R. *De l'utilité pour l'histoire de France de quelques chroniques anglaises de la première moitié du xv^e siècle*. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. lxxxv. Paris, 1924.
- Plancher, U. (1667-1750). *Histoire du duché de Bourgogne*. 3 vols. Dijon, 1739-48.
- Plauchut, E. *Le Berry*. In *Revue des Deux Mondes*, vols. cix, cx. Paris, 1892.
- [Pluscard.] *Liber Pluscardensis*. Ed. F. J. H. Skene. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1877-80.
- Poggio Bracciolini, F. (1380-1459). *Opera*. Basle, 1538.
- *Epistolae*. Ed. T. Tonelli. Florence, 1832.
- [Pol. Relig. Po.] *Political, Religious and Love Poems*. Ed. F. J. Furnivall. E.E.T.S. London, 1903.
- [Pol. Songs.] *Political Poems and Songs, Edward III to Richard II*. Ed. T. Wright. R.S. 2 vols. London, 1859-61.
- [Pol. Verg.] *Polydori Virgillii (d. 1555) Urbinatis Anglicae Historiae Libri xxvii*. Basel, 1570.
- Pollard, A. W. *An English Garner. Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse*. Westminster, 1903.
- Pollock, F. and Maitland, F. W. *History of English Law*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1898.
- Polwhele, R. *History of Devonshire*. 3 vols. Exeter, 1793-7.
- Polybiblion. Revue bibliographique et universelle*. Paris, 1868, &c.
- Pommeraye, J. F. *Histoire de l'Église Cathédrale de Rouen*. Rouen, 1686.
- Pontau mont, E. le C. de. *Documents inédits sur le Siège de Cherbourg en 1378*. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xxiv. Caen, 1859.
- Poole, R. L. *Wycliffe and Movements for Reform*. London, 1889.
- Porée, A. A. *Histoire de l'abbaye du Bec*. 2 vols. Évreux, 1901.
- Port, C. *Inventaire analytique des Archives anciennes de la Mairie d'Angers*. Paris, 1861.
- *Dictionnaire historique, géographique et biographique de Maine-et-Loire*. 3 vols. Paris, Angers, 1874-8.
- Portal, C. *Levée d'un Subside dans le Diocèse d'Albi en 1407 pour le Rachat du Château de Lourdes*. In *Annales du Midi*, vol. iii. Toulouse, 1892.
- *Histoire de la Ville de Cordes (Tarn)*, 1222-1797. Albi, 1902.
- *Les Insurrections des Tuchins dans le Pays de Languedoc vers 1382-1384*. *Annales du Midi*, vol. iv. Toulouse, 1892.
- Posillie. *See* Lindenblatt.
- Postel, R. *Siège et Capitulation de Bayeux en 1417*. Caen, 1873.
- *Nos Aïeux*. Paris, 1892.

514 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Poulson, G. (1783-1858). *Beverlac or the Antiquities and History of the Town of Beverley*. London, 1829.
- *History and Antiquities of the Seigniorie of Holderness*. 2 vols. Hull, 1840.
- Powel, D. (1552-1598). *History of Wales*. Merthyr Tydfil, 1816.
- Powicke, F. M. *The Loss of Normandy*. Manchester, 1913.
- Pradel, A. *St Vincent Ferrer*. Trans. by T. A. Dixon. London, 1875.
- Prat, H. *Études Historiques, xiv^e et xv^e siècles*. Paris, 1853.
- *Études Littéraires, xiv^e et xv^e siècles*. Paris, 1853.
- Pray, G. *Annales Regum Hungariae*. 5 vols. Vienna, 1764-70.
- *Historia Regum Hungariae*. 3 vols. Buda, 1800-1.
- Prentout, H. *Les États Provinciaux de Normandie*. 3 vols. Caen, 1925-7.
- Prevel, J. L. *Notice sur Odette ou Odinette de Champdivers et Marguerite de Valois sa Fille*. In *Annales de la Société Académique de Nantes*, ser. v, vol. x. Nantes, 1879.
- Price, J. E. *Account of the Guildhall of the City of London*. London, 1886.
- Prince, J. *Worthies of Devon*. London, 1701.
- Priorat, J. (d. c. 1290). *Li Abrejançe de l'Ordre de Chevalerie*. Ed. U. Robert. Soc. des Anciens Textes français. Paris, 1897.
- Prioux, S. *Monographie de l'ancienne Abbaye royale Saint Yved de Braine*. Paris, 1859.
- Procès Verbaux de la Société archéologique d'Eure-et-Loir*. Chartres, 1861, &c.
- Promptorium Parvulorum*. Ed. A. Way. Camden Soc. 3 vols. 1842-65.
- Prost, B. *Traicté de la Forme et Devis comme on faicte les Tournois*. Paris, 1878.
- *Quelques Acquisitions de Manuscrits par les Ducs de Bourgogne, Philippe-le-Hardi et Jean sans Peur*. In *Archives historiques, artistiques, et littéraires*, vol. ii. Paris, 1890.
- *Les Tapissières du Duc de Berry*, 1416. *Ibid.* vol. i. Paris, 1889.
- *Une Nouvelle Source de Documents sur les Artistes dijonnais du xv^e siècle*. In *Gazette des Beaux Arts*. Paris, 1890.
- *Quelques Documents sur l'Histoire des Arts en France*. In *Gazette des Beaux Arts*. Paris, 1887.
- Prudhomme, A. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives communales: Ville de Grenoble*. Grenoble, 1899, 1906.
- Prynne, W. *Brief Register of all Parliamentary Writs*. 4 vols. in 2. London, 1659-64.
- Puiseux, L. *Siège et Prise de Caen par les Anglais en 1417*. Caen, 1858.
- *L'Émigration Normande et la Colonisation Anglaise en Normandie au xv^e siècle*. Caen, 1866.
- *Siège et Prise de Rouen par les Anglais (1418-1419) d'après un Poème anglais contemporain*. Caen, 1867.
- *Les Docteurs Normands au commencement du xv^e siècle*. Paris, 1864.
- *Des Insurrections populaires en Normandie pendant l'Occupation Anglaise au xv^e siècle*. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xix. Caen, 1851.
- Pulka, P. (1370-1430). *Letters of*. Ed. F. Firnhaber. In *Archiv für Kunde oesterreichischer Geschichtsquellen*, vol. xv. Vienna, 1856.
- Pulling, A. (1813-1895). *The Order of the Coif*. London, 1897.
- Purey-Cust, A. P. *The Heraldry of York Minster*. 2 vols. Leeds, 1890-6.
- *Walks round York Minster*. Leeds, 1907.
- *The Collar of SS*. Leeds, 1910.
- Puymaigre, T. J. de Boudet de. *La Cour littéraire de Don Juan II, roi de Castille*. 2 vols. Paris, 1873.

- Pyne, H. *England and France in the 15th Century*. London, 1870.
- Quadrado, J. M. *Salamanca, Avila y Segovia*. Barcelona, 1884.
- *Aragon*. Barcelona, 1886.
- Quaritch, B. *General Catalogue of Books*. 7 vols. and 10 supplements. London, 1887-97.
- Quatrebarbes, T. de. *Œuvres complètes du roi René*. 4 vols. Angers, 1845-6.
- Quétif, J. (1618-1690). *Scriptores ordinis Praedicatorum*. 2 vols. Paris, 1719-21.
- Quicherat, J. E. J. (1814-1887). *Procès de Condamnation et de Réhabilitation de Jeanne d'Arc*. 5 vols. Paris, 1841-9.
- *Aperçus nouveaux sur l'Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc*. Paris, 1850.
- *Histoire de Costume en France*. Paris, 1875.
- Rabbe, F. *Jeanne d'Arc en Angleterre*. Paris, 1891.
- Rabutaux, A. P. E. *De la Prostitution en Europe*. Paris, 1881.
- Rackham, R. B. *The Nave of Westminster*. In *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. iv. London, 1909.
- Radford, L. B. *Henry Beaufort*. London, 1908.
- *Cardinal Beaufort*. In *Typical English Churchmen*, vol. ii. S.P.C.K. London, 1909.
- Raine, J., senior. *History of North Durham*. London, 1852.
- *A Brief Account of Durham Cathedral*. Newcastle, 1833.
- *Catterick Church: Contract for its Building in 1412*. London, 1834.
- Raine, J., junior. *Historians of the Church of York*. R.S. 3 vols. London, 1879-86.
- *York*. London, 1893.
- Rait, R. S. "The Kingis Quair" and the New Criticism. Aberdeen, 1898.
- *Scotland*. London, 1911.
- Raleigh, W. (1552-1618). *History of the World*. 1614.
- Rimbaud, A. *Histoire de la Civilisation française*. 2 vols. Paris, 1885-7.
- Ramet, F. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Loire-Inférieure*. 3 vols. Paris, Nantes, 1865, 1879.
- Ramsay, Sir J. H. *Lancaster and York*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1892.
- *The Foundations of England*. 2 vols. London, 1898.
- Ranke, L. *Weltgeschichte*. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1895.
- Rankin, R. *The Marquis of Argenson: and Richard II*. London, 1901.
- Ransom, C. *A Short History of England*. London, 1894.
- Ranzano, P. (1420-1492). *Vita S. Vincentii Ferrerii*. In *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. x.
- Raoulet, J., *Chronique de (1403-1429)*. In *Jean Chartier, Chronique de Charles VII*. Ed. Vallet de Viriville. Vol. iii.
- Rapin-Thoyras, P. de (1661-1725). *Acta Regia*. Trans. by S. Whatley. 4 vols. London, 1726.
- *Histoire d'Angleterre*. 13 vols. The Hague, 1724-36. Trans. by N. Tindal. 4 vols. London, 1743-7.
- Rashdall, H. *New College, Oxford*. London, 1901.
- Rastell, J. (d. 1536). *The Pastime of People; or, the Chronicles of Divers Realms*. London, 1811.
- Raymond, P. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Basses-Pyrénées*. 4 vols. Paris, 1863-7.
- Raynal, L. (b. 1808). *Histoire du Berry*. 4 vols. Bourges, 1844-7.
- Raynaldus. *See* Rinaldi.
- Raynaud, P. *Rondeaux et autres Poésies du xv^e siècle*. Paris, 1889.
- Reader, W. *History and Antiquities of the City of Coventry*. Coventry, 1810.

516 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Reber, B. (1805–1875). Felix Hemmerlin von Zürich. Zürich, 1846.
 Red Book of the Exchequer. Ed. H. Hall. R.S. 3 vols. London, 1896.
 Rede, R., Episcopal Register of (1397–1415). Ed. C. Deedes. Sussex Record Society. 2 vols. London, 1908, 1910.
 Redman, Robert. *Historia Henrici Quinti*. In *Memorials of Henry V*. Ed. C. A. Cole. R.S. London, 1858.
 [Reg. Hereford.] Diocesis Herefordensis, Registrum Edmundi Lacy, Registrum Thome Poltone. Ed. A. T. Bannister. In *Publications of Canterbury and York Soc.*, vol. xxii. London, 1918.
 Regnier, J. (d. after 1463), *Les Fortunes et Adversitez de*. Ed. P. Lacroix. Geneva, 1867.
 Regnault, R. *Registre des Recettes de Dépenses de la Ville de Boulogne-sur-Mer (1415–1416)*. In *Mém. de la Soc. Académique de l'Arrondissement de Boulogne-sur-Mer*, vol. vii. Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1882.
 Reichstagsakten, Deutsche (1376–1431). Ed. J. Weizsäcker, D. Kerler, &c. Munich and Gotha, 1867, &c.
 Reiffenberg, F. A. (1795–1850). *Le Chevalier au Cygne et Godefroy de Bouillon*. In *Monuments pour servir à l'Histoire des Provinces de Namur, de Hainaut, et de Luxembourg*. 3 vols. Brussels, 1846–54.
 — *Histoire du Comté de Hainaut*. 3 vols. Brussels, 1846.
 Reiser von Landskron, F. (c. 1402–1458). *Reformation des K. Sigmund*. Ed. W. Boehm. Leipzig, 1876.
 Reliquary, The. London, 1860, &c.
 Reliquiae Antiquae. Ed. T. Wright and J. O. Halliwell. 2 vols. London, 1841.
 Renan, E. *L'Art du Moyen Age et la Cause de sa Décadence*. In *Revue des Deux Mondes*, vol. xl. Paris, 1862.
 Renard, G. *Le Château de Bar autrefois et aujourd'hui*. In *Mém. de la Soc. des Lettres, Sciences et Arts de Bar-le-Duc*, ser. III, vol. v. Bar-le-Duc, 1896.
 René d'Anjou (1409–1480), *Les Tournois de*. Ed. Champollion, Dubois and Charles Motte. Paris, 1827.
 Report on Foedera. *See* Cooper, C. P.
 Report touching the Dignity of a Peer of the Realm. 5 vols. London, 1820–9.
 Retrospective Review, The. London, 1820–8.
 [Return Parl.] Return of Names of Members of Parliament. 4 vols. London, 1879.
 Revue Anglo-Française. Poitiers, 1833, &c.
 Revue Archéologique. Paris, 1844, &c.
 Revue Archéologique du Département de la Manche. Valognes, 1843.
 Revue de l'Anjou. Angers, 1881, &c.
 Revue de l'Art Chrétien. Paris, Tournai, Arras, 1857, &c.
 Revue de Rouen. Rouen, 1833, &c.
 Revue d'Histoire moderne et contemporaine. Paris, 1899, &c.
 Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement. Paris, 1881, &c.
 Revue Lyonnaise. Lyons, 1881, &c.
 Reygersbergh, J. (c. 1550). *Chroniick van Zeeland*. 2 vols. Middelburg, 1644.
 Reyner, C. *De Antiquitate Ordinis Sancti Benedicti in regno Angliae*. Douai, 1626.
 Reynolds, H. E. *A Short History of the Ancient Diocese of Exeter*. Exeter, 1895.
 Ribadieu, H. *Histoire de la Conquête de Guyenne par les Français*. Bordeaux, 1866.
 — *Les Châteaux de la Gironde*. Bordeaux, 1856.
 Ribblesdale, Lord. *The Queen's Buckhounds and Stag Hunting Recollections*. London, 1897.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 517

- Ricart, Robt. (c. 1479). *The Maire of Bristowe is Kalendar*. Ed. L. T. Smith. Camden Soc. London, 1872.
- Richard, Ch. *Recherches sur Rouen: Fortifications. Porte Martinville*. Rouen, 1844.
- Richental, U. von (d. 1437). *Chronik des Constanzer Concils*. Augsburg, 1483.
- Richey, A. G. *A Short History of the Irish People down to the Date of the Plantation of Ulster*. Dublin, 1887.
- Lectures on the History of Ireland. Dublin, 1869.
- Riddell, J. *Tracts Legal and Historical*. Edinburgh, 1835.
- Ridpath, G. (1717-1772). *Border History of England and Scotland*. London, 1776.
- Riezler, S. *Geschichte Baierns*. 3 vols. Gotha, 1878-89.
- *Nachtselden und Järgeld in Bayern*. In *Baierische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Historische Klasse*, vol. xxiii. Munich, 1906.
- Rigaux, E. *La Commune de Boulogne en 1415*. Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1905.
- Riley, H. T. *Memorials of London and London Life in the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries (1276-1419)*. London, 1868.
- Rinaldi (or Raynaldus), Oderic (1595-1671). *Annales ecclesiastici*. 15 vols. Lucca, 1747, &c.
- Ritson, J. *Bibliotheca Poetica*. London, 1802.
- Ritter, E. *Poésies des XIV^e et XV^e siècles publiées d'après le MS. de la Bibliothèque de Genève*. In *Bulletin de l'Institut National Génevois*, vol. xxiii. Geneva, 1880.
- Ritter, G. *Extraits du Journal du Trésor*. *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. lxxiii. Paris, 1912.
- Rittiez, F. *Histoire du Palais de Justice et du Parlement*. Paris, 1860.
- *L'Hôtel de Ville et la Bourgeoisie de Paris*. Paris, 1862.
- Rivière, H. F. *Histoire des Institutions de l'Auvergne*. 2 vols. Paris, 1871.
- Robert, U. *Les Signes d'Infamie au Moyen Age*. Paris, 1891.
- Roberts, L. J. Owen Glyndwr. Wrexham, 1904.
- Robertson, W. A. Scott. *Coulyng Castle*. In *Archæologia Cantiana*, vol. xi. London, 1877.
- Robineau, E. M. D. *Christine de Pisan, sa Vie et ses Œuvres*. St Omer, 1882.
- Robinson, C. J. *A History of the Mansions and Manors of Herefordshire*. London, 1873.
- *A History of the Castles of Herefordshire*. London, 1869.
- Robinson, J. A. *An Unrecognised Westminster Chronicler (1381-1394)*. In *Proceedings of the British Academy*, vol. iii. London, 1907.
- *Simon Langham, Abbot of Westminster*. In *Church Quarterly Review*, vol. xlvi. London, 1908.
- Robinson, J. A. and James, M. R. *The Manuscripts of Westminster Abbey*. Cambridge, 1909.
- Robuchon, J. *Paysages et Monuments du Poitou*. Paris, 1886-92.
- *Paysages et Monuments de la Bretagne*. Paris, 1892.
- Rochas, V. *Les Parias de France et d'Espagne*. Paris, 1876.
- Rocher, Ch. *Les Bourguignons en Velay (1419-1420)*. In *Tablettes Historiques du Velay, années v, vi*. Le Puy, 1875-6.
- Rock, D. (1799-1871). *The Church of Our Fathers*. Ed. G. W. Hart and W. H. Frere. 4 vols. London, 1903-4.
- Roger, P. A. *The Poetical Remains of King Charles the First of Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1873.

518 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- [Roger of Hoveden.] *Chronica Rogeri de Hovedene*. Ed. W. Stubbs. R.S. 4 vols. London, 1868-71.
- Rogers, J. E. T. (1823-1890). *Oxford City Documents*. Oxford, 1892.
- Rogers, W. H. H. *The Ancient Sepulchral Effigies and monumental and manorial Sculpture of Devon*. Exeter, 1877.
- Roman, J. *Montres et Revues des Capitaines dauphinois*. Grenoble, 1888.
- *Inventaires et Documents relatifs aux Joyaux et Tapisseries des Princes d'Orléans-Valois*. Paris, 1894.
- Romania. Paris, 1872, &c.
- Romelot, T. L. *Description historique et monumentale de l'Église patriarcale, primatiale et métropolitaine de Bourges*. Bourges, 1824.
- Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte. Rome, 1887, &c.
- Romocki, S. J. *Geschichte der Explosivstoffe*. 2 vols. Berlin, 1895, 1896.
- Roncière, C. de la. *Histoire de la Marine Française*. 2 vols. Paris, 1899-1900.
- Ros, Lord de (1797-1874). *Memorials of the Tower of London*. London, 1867.
- Rosières, F. de. *Stemmatum Lotharingiae, ac Barri Ducum, Tomi Septem*. Paris, 1580.
- Ross, J. *See* Rous.
- Rossignol, C. and Garnier, G. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales : Côte d'Or*. 6 vols. Paris, 1863-94.
- [Rot. Chart.] *Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londinensi asservati*. Ed. T. D. Hardy. London, 1837.
- [Rot. Norm. (Hardy).] *Rotuli Normanniae in Turri Londinensi asservati Johanne et Henrico Quinto Angliae Regibus*. Ed. T. D. Hardy. London, 1835.
- [Rot. Parl.] *Rolls of Parliament*. 7 vols. London, 1767-1832.
- [Rot. Select.] *Rotuli selecti ad res Anglicas et Hibernicas spectantes*. Ed. J. Hunter. London, 1834.
- Rotuli Scotiae*. 2 vols. London, 1814.
- Roujoux, P. G. de. *Histoire pittoresque de l'Angleterre et de ses Possessions dans les Indes*. 2 vols. Paris, 1835.
- *Histoire des Rois et des Ducs de Bretagne*. 4 vols. Paris, 1828, 1829.
- Roujoux, P. G. and Mainguet, A. *Histoire d'Angleterre*. 2 vols. Paris, 1844-5.
- Round, J. H. *The Commune of London*. Westminster, 1899.
- Rouquette, J. *Le Rouergue sous les Anglais*. Millau, 1887.
- Rous (*al.* Ross, Rouse or Rows), J. (1411-1491). *Story of Richard Beauchamp (1382-1439)*. In *Historia vitæ et regni Ricardi II*. Ed. T. Hearne. 2 vols. Oxford, 1729. With illustrations in Strutt, *Manners*, vol. ii.
- *Historia Regum Angliae*. Ed. T. Hearne. Oxford, 1716.
- *The Rows Roll*. London, 1845.
- Rouse. *See* Rous.
- Rouyer, N. J. and Hucher, E. *Histoire du Jeton au Moyen Age*. Paris, 1858.
- Rowe, Benedicta J. H. *A contemporary Account of the Hundred Years' War from 1415 to 1429*. In *E.H.R.*, vol. xli. London, 1926.
- Rowlatt, A. L. *Henry the Fifth*. London, 1865.
- Rows. *See* Rous.
- Roxburgh Ballads, The. Ed. W. Chappell. Ballad Soc. London, 1869, &c.
- Roy, C. *Mélusine*. Ligugé, 1898.
- Roy, M. *Le Couvent des Dominicains de Sens*. Sens, 1902.
- [Roy. Let.] *Royal and Historical Letters during the Reign of Henry IV*. Ed. H. C. Hingeston. R.S. London, 1860.

- Royal Visits to Coventry in the Olden Time. Coventry, 1858.
- Roye, Gilles de (1415-1478). *Chronique* (1414-1431). Ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove. In *Chroniques relatives à l'Histoire de la Belgique sous la domination des ducs de Bourgogne*, vol. i. Brussels, 1870.
- Rozmital, L. von (d. after 1467). *Ritter-, Hof- und Pilger-Reise durch die Abendlande* (1465-1467). Stuttgart, 1844.
- Ruding, R. *Annals of the Coinage of Great Britain*. 4 vols. London, 1817.
- Ruestow, F. W. *Geschichte der Infanterie*. 2 vols. Gotha, 1857-8.
- Ruisseauville, *Chronique de*. In *Archives historiques et littéraires du Nord de la France et du Midi de la Belgique*, ser. 1, vol. iv. Valenciennes, 1834.
- Ruprich-Robert, V. *L'Architecture Normande aux XI^e et XII^e siècles en Normandie et en Angleterre*. Paris, 1884, &c.
- Ruskin, J. *Val d'Arno*. New York, 1886.
- Rye, W. *An Index of Norfolk Topography*. Index Society. London, 1881.
- Rye, W. B. *Visits to Rochester and Chatham made by royal, noble and distinguished Personages*. London, 1865.
- Rymer, Thos. (1641-1713). *Foedera, &c.* 20 vols. London, 1704, &c.
- [*Rymkronik van Brabant.*] *De Brabantsche yeesten, of Rymkronyk van Brabant*. Ed. J. F. Willems. Brussels, 1839-69.
- Sabatier, P. *Étude sur la Concession de l'Indulgence de la Portiuncula*. In *Rev. Historique*, vol. lxii. Paris, 1896.
- Sablon, V. *Histoire et Description de l'Église cathédrale de Chartres*. Ed. K. L. Merlet. Chartres, 1860.
- Saint-Denys, *Chronique du religieux de* (1380-1422). Ed. L. Bellaguet. Coll. de documents inédits. 6 vols. Paris, 1839.
- Saint-Foix, K. Poullain de. *Essais historiques sur Paris*. 3 vols. Paris, 1759.
- Saint-Gelais, Octavien de (c. 1466-1502). *Le Séjour d'Honneur*. Paris, 1519.
- Saint-Germain, Stanislas de. *Un Partage mobilier en 1412*. In *Bulletin Monumental*, ser. 11, vol. viii. Paris, 1852.
- Saint-Mémin. *Rapport sur les Restes de Monuments de l'Ancienne Chartreuse de Dijon*. In *Mém. de la Commission des Antiquités du Département de la Côte-d'Or*, vol. ii. Paris, 1847.
- Saint-Paul, Jean de (c. 1475). *Chronique de Bretagne*. Ed. A. de la Borderie. Nantes, 1881.
- Sainte-Marthe, P. S. (1571-1650). *Histoire généalogique de la Maison de la Tremoille*. Paris, 1668.
- Salmon, N. *Antiquities of Surrey*. London, 1736.
- Salmon, P., *al.* Salemon or *Le Fruitier* (fl. 1409). *Les demandes faites par le Roi Charles VI touchant son État et le Gouvernement de sa Personne*. Ed. G. A. Crapelet. Paris, 1833.
- Salutati, Coluccio (1330-1406), *Epistolario di*. Ed. F. Novati. 4 vols. Rome, 1891-1911.
- Samaran, C. *La chronique inédite de Jean Chartier (1422-1450) et les derniers livres du Religieux de St Denis*. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. lxxxvii. Paris, 1926.
- *La chronique latine de Jean Chartier (1422-1450)*. In *Ann. Bull. Soc. de l'Hist. de France*. Paris, 1926.
- Samazeuilh, J. F. *Histoire de l'Agenais, du Condomois et du Bazadais*. 2 vols. Auch, 1846-7.
- *Nérac et Pau*. Agen, 1854.

- Sandeman, G. A. C. Calais under English rule. Oxford, 1908.
- Sandford, F. (1630-1693). Genealogical History of the Kings and Queens of England. London, 1707.
- History of the Kings of Portugal. London, 1662.
- Sandys, J. E. A History of Classical Scholarship. 3 vols. Cambridge, 1906-8.
- Sanford, J. L. Estimates of the English Kings. London, 1872.
- Sanford, J. L. and Townsend, M. The Great Governing Families of England. 2 vols. London, 1865.
- Santarem, M. F., Viscount of. Recherches sur la Priorité de la Découverte des Pays situés sur la Côte Occidentale d'Afrique. Paris, 1842.
- Atlas compris de Mappemondes et de Cartes hydrographiques et historiques depuis le xi^e jusqu'au xvii^e siècle. Paris, 1842.
- Sanuto, M. (1466-1536). Vitæ Ducum Venetorum Italice scriptæ. In Muratori, vol. xxii.
- Sarrazin, A. Histoire de Rouen d'après les Miniatures des Manuscrits. Rouen, 1904.
- Pierre Cauchon, Juge de Jeanne d'Arc. Paris, 1901.
- Jeanne d'Arc et la Normandie. Paris, 1896.
- Sathas, C. N. Documents inédits relatifs à l'histoire de la Grèce au Moyen Age. 9 vols. Paris, 1880-90.
- Saturday Review, The. London, 1856, &c.
- Saulcy, F. C. de. Histoire numismatique de Henri V et Henri VI rois d'Angleterre pendant qu'ils ont régné en France. Paris, 1878.
- Sauret, A. Essai historique sur la ville d'Embrun. Gap, 1860.
- Sauvage, D. (c. 1520-c. 1587). Chronique de Flandre. Lyons, 1562.
- Sauvage, E. P. Harfleur au xiv^e siècle. Rouen, 1875.
- Catalogue chronologique des Grands Baillis de Caux du xiiii^e au xvi^e siècles. In Soc. de l'Hist. de Normandie, Mélanges, ser. 1. Rouen, 1891.
- Notes sur le Monastère des Emmurées à Rouen. Ibid.
- Un Plan d'Éducation au xiv^e siècle. In Précis analytique des Travaux de l'Académie de Rouen. Rouen, 1893.
- Sauval, H. (1623-1676). Histoire et Recherches des Antiquités de la ville de Paris. 3 vols. Paris, 1724.
- Sauvan, J. B. B. Histoire et Description pittoresque du Palais de Justice, de la Conciergerie, et de la Sainte Chapelle de Paris. Paris, 1825.
- Savaron, J. (1550-1622). Les origines de Clairmont, ville capitale de l'Auvergne. Paris, 1622.
- Scargill-Bird, S. R. A Guide to the various classes of Documents in the Public Record Office. London, 1908.
- Schedel, H. (c. 1493). Chronicorum liber. Nürnberg, 1493.
- Schirrmacher, F. W. Geschichte von Spanien. Vols. iii-vi of F. W. Lembke, Geschichte von Spanien. 6 vols. Hamburg, Gotha, 1881-93.
- Schmidt, C. Histoire du Chapitre de St Thomas de Strasbourg. Strasbourg, 1860.
- Schmidt, C. G. A. Essai sur Jean Gerson. Strasbourg, 1839.
- Schmidt, E. A. Geschichte von Frankreich. 4 vols. Hamburg, 1835, 1848.
- Geschichte Aragoniens im Mittelalter. Leipzig, 1828.
- Schmidt, K. Margareta von Anjou vor und bei Shakespeare. In Palaestra, vol. liv. Berlin, 1906.
- Schoettl, A. Aus dem Haushalt einer Königin. Munich, 1898.
- Schultz, A. Deutsches Leben im xiv und xv Jahrhundert. Vienna, 1892.
- Das häusliche Leben der Europäischen Kulturvölker vom Mittelalter bis zur zweiten Hälfte des xviii Jahrhunderts. Munich, 1903.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 521

- Schwab, J. B. Johannes Gerson. Würzburg, 1858.
- Scotichronicon (by J. Fordun, continued by W. Bower). Ed. W. Goodall. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1775.
- Ed. T. Hearne. 5 vols. Oxford, 1722.
- Scotièrre, L. de la. Rapport sur l'Abbaye et l'Église de Loulay. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xii. Caen, 1841.
- Scott, G. G. Gleanings from Westminster Abbey. London, 1861.
- Scott, J. S. D. The British Army. Its origin, progress and equipment. 3 vols. London, 1868–80.
- Scott, Sir Walter (1771–1832). Tales of a Grandfather. *History of France*. Edinburgh, 1851.
- Scottish Historical Review. Glasgow, 1905–28.
- Scriven, J. A Treatise on the Law of Copyholds. London, 1896.
- Scrope, G. P. History of the Manor and Ancient Barony of Castle Combe in the County of Wiltshire. 1852.
- Scrope, S. (1398–1472). The Epistle of Othea to Hector. Translated from the French of Christine de Pisan. Ed. G. F. Warner. Roxburghe Club. London, 1904.
- Scrope and Grosvenor Roll. Ed. N. H. Nicolas. 2 vols. London, 1832.
- Secreta Secretorum, Three Prose Versions of. Ed. R. R. Steele. E.E.T.S. London, 1898.
- Seebohm, F. The English Village Community. London, 1883.
- Selden, J. Titles of Honour. London, 1631.
- Sellier, C. Le Quartier Barbette. Paris, 1899.
- Sénemaud, E. Inventaire sommaire des Archives départementales: Ardennes. Paris, 1888.
- Ser Cambius. *See* Cambi.
- Sergeant, P. W. The Cathedral Church of Winchester. London, 1910.
- Serravalle, Giovanni dei Bertoldi da (b. 1350). *Translatio et Comentum totius libri Dantis Aldigherii*. Ed. M. da Civezza and T. Domenichelli. Prati, 1891.
- Serres (or Serranus), J. de (c. 1540–1598). *Inventaire général de l'Histoire de France*. 3 vols. Paris, 1600. Translated into English by E. Grimeston. London, 1611.
- Servais, V. *Annales historiques du Barrois de 1352 à 1411*. 2 vols. Bar-le-Duc, 1865–7.
- Servion, J. (d. c. 1466). *Geste et Chroniques de la Mayson de Savoie*. Ed. F. É. Bollati. 2 vols. Turin, 1879.
- Seyer, S. *Memoirs historical and topographical of Bristol and its Neighbourhood*. 2 vols. Bristol, 1821–3.
- Shafter, T. A Few Observations on the Leprosy of the Middle Ages. Exeter, 1835.
- Sharpe, R. R. *London and the Kingdom*. 3 vols. London, 1894, &c.
- *Calendar of Wills, Court of Husting, London*. 2 vols. London, 1889–90.
- Shepherd, W. *The Life of Poggio Bracciolini*. Liverpool, 1837.
- [*Sheriffs' List*.] *List of Sheriffs for England and Wales from the Earliest Times to 1831*. London, 1898.
- Sherzer, J. B. *The Ile of Ladies*. Berlin, 1903.
- Shillingford, J., *Letters and papers of*. Ed. S. A. Moore. Camden Soc. London, 1871.
- Shillington, V. M. and Chapman, A. B. W. *The Commercial Relations of England and Portugal*. London, 1907.

522 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Shore, T. W. *A History of Hampshire*. London, 1892.
 ——— *Guide to Southampton and Neighbourhood*. Southampton, 1882.
 [Short Chron.] *Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles*. Ed. J. Gairdner. Camden Soc. London, 1880.
 Shropshire, Visitation of, in 1623. Harleian Soc. 2 vols. London, 1889.
 Shropshire Archaeological and Natural History Society. *Transactions*. Shrewsbury, 1878, &c.
 Sickel, Th. *Ambrosianische Republik und das Haus Savoyen*. In *Sitzungsberichte des philosophisch-historischen Classe der Kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaften*, vol. xx. Vienna, 1856.
 Silvestre, J. B. *Paléographie universelle. Collection de fac-simile d'Écritures de tous les Peuples et de tous les Temps*. 4 pts. Paris, 1839-42. Translation by F. Madden. 2 vols. London, 1850.
 Simeonis, S. (c. 1322). *See* Nasmith, J.
 Simon, A. L. *The History of the Wine Trade in England*. 3 vols. London, 1906-9.
 Simonyi, E. *Monumenta Hungariae historica. Diplomataria*. Vol. v. Pest, 1859.
 Sismondi, J. C. L. S. *Histoire des Républiques Italiennes du Moyen Age*. 16 vols. Paris, 1826.
 ——— *Histoire des Français*. 31 vols. Paris, 1821-44.
 Skeat, W. W. *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*. Oxford, 1898.
 Skelton, J. (b. c. 1460-1529). *Poetical Works*. Ed. A. Dyce. 2 vols. London, 1843.
 Sleigh, J. *History of the Ancient Parish of Leek*. Leek, 1862.
 Smet, J. J. de. *Corpus Chronicorum Flandriae*. Commission royale d'histoire de Belgique. Brussels, 1837, &c.
 Smith, G. G. *The Transition Period*. In *Saintsbury's Periods of English Literature*. Edinburgh, 1900.
 Smith, Goldwin. *The United Kingdom. A Political History*. 2 vols. London, 1899.
 Smith, H. E. *History of Conisburgh Castle*. Worksop, 1887.
 Smith, I. Gregory. *Worcester*. In *Diocesan Histories*. London, 1883.
 Smith, J. Challoner. *Index of Wills proved in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury (1383-1558)*. *The Index Library*. 2 vols. London, 1893, 1895.
 Smith, J. T. *Antiquities of Westminster*. London, 1807.
 ——— *Antiquities of London*. London, 1791.
 Smith, S. A. *John of Gaunt*. Westminster, 1904.
 Smith, T. *Catalogus Librorum Bibliothecae Cottonianae*. Oxford, 1696.
 Smith, T. F. *Antiquities of London*. London, 1793.
 Smythe, J. *Certain discourses concerning the Forms and Effects of divers Sorts of Weapons*. London, 1590.
 Smyttere, J. P. E. de. *Essai historique sur Iolande de Flandre, Comtesse de Bar. Lille*, 1877.
 Snappe's *Formulary and other records*. Ed. H. E. Salter. Oxford Historical Soc. Oxford, 1924.
 Snelling, T. (1712-1773). *A View of the Gold Coin and Coinage of England*. London, 1763.
 Snow, T. B. *The Lollards*. In *Dublin Review*, vol. cxviii. Dublin, 1896.
 Snoy, R. (1477-1537). *De Rebus Batavicis libri xiiii*. In P. F. Sweert, *Rerum Belgicarum Annales*. Frankfurt, 1620.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 523

- Société académique de l'arrondissement de Boulogne-sur-Mer. Mémoires. Boulogne-sur-Mer, 1866, &c.
- Société archéologique de Tarn-et-Garonne. Bulletin. Montauban, 1873, &c.
- Société archéologique de Touraine. Mémoires. Tours, 1842, &c.
- Bulletin. Tours, 1868, &c.
- Société de l'Histoire de France. Bulletin. Paris, 1835, &c.
- Société de l'Histoire de Normandie. Bulletin. Rouen, 1867, &c.
- Mélanges. Rouen, 1891, &c.
- Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de l'Île de France. Mémoires and Bulletin. Paris, 1874, &c.
- Société des Antiquaires de la Morinie. Mémoires. St Omer, 1834, &c.
- Société des Antiquaires de la Normandie. Mémoires and Bulletin. Caen, 1825, &c.
- Société de statistique des Sciences naturelles et des Arts industriels du département de l'Isère. Bulletin. Grenoble, 1840, &c.
- Société historique de Compiègne. Compiègne, 1869, &c.
- Soleil, F. Les Heures Gothiques et la Littérature pieux aux xv^e et xvi^e siècles. Rouen, 1882.
- Somner, H. (1598–1669). Antiquities of Canterbury. London, 1703.
- Songe Véritable. Ed. H. Moranvillé. In Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris, vol. xvii. Paris, 1891.
- Sorel, A. Procès contre des Animaux et Insectes suivis au Moyen Age dans la Picardie et le Valois. In Bulletin de la Société historique de Compiègne, vol. iii. Compiègne, 1876.
- La Prise de Jeanne d'Arc. Paris, 1889.
- Souchet, J. B. (1589–1651). Histoire du Diocèse et de la Ville de Chartres. 4 vols. 1866–73.
- Souchon, M. Die Papstwahlen in der Zeit des grossen Schismas. 2 vols. Brunswick, 1898–9.
- South, J. F. (1797–1882). Memorials of the Craft of Surgery in England. Ed. D'Arcy Power. London, 1886.
- Southey, R. (1774–1843). Lives of the British Admirals. 5 vols. London, 1833–40.
- Soyez, E. A. La Picardie historique et monumentale. Amiens, 1898–9.
- Speed, J. (1555–1629). History of Great Britain. London, 1632.
- Speght, T. The Workes of our antient and lerned English Poet G. Chaucer. London, 1598.
- Spelman, Sir H. (1562–1641). Glossarium Archaiologicum. London, 1664.
- Spencer, O. L. The Life of Henry Chichele, Archbishop of Canterbury. London, 1783.
- Sphere, The. London, 1900, &c.
- Spondanus (Henri de Sponde). Annalium Baronii Continuatio. 2 vols. Paris, 1659.
- Spont, A. La Gabelle du Sel in Languedoc au xv^e siècle. In Annales du Midi, no. 12. Toulouse, 1891.
- Spruner, K. und Mencke, Th. Hand-Atlas für die Geschichte des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit. Gotha, 1880.
- Sr̄oboda, J. Il medagliere Mediceo nel R. Museo Nazionale di Firenze, Secolo xv–xvi. Florence, 1899.
- Stacke, L. Deutsche Geschichte. 3 vols. Bielefeld, 1880.
- Stafford, E., Register of (1395–1419). Ed. F. C. Hingeston-Randolph. Exeter, 1886.

524 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Staindel, J. (d. after 1508). *Chronicon*. In *Oefele, Rerum Boicarum Scriptores*, vol. i. Augsburg, 1763.
- Stanley, A. P. *Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey*. London, 1868.
- *Memorials of Canterbury*. London, 1855.
- On the Deposition of the Remains of Catherine of Valois, Queen of Henry V, in Westminster Abbey. In *Archaeologia*, vol. xlv. London, 1881.
- Stapleton, T. (1805–1849). *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*. Camden Soc. London, 1846.
- *Magni Rotuli Scaccarii Normanniae sub Regibus Angliae*. 2 vols. London, 1840–4.
- Starrabba, R. *Il Testamento di Martino Re di Sicilia*. Palermo, 1876.
- [Stat.] *Statutes of the Realm*. 11 vols. London, 1810–22.
- State Papers, Calendar of. Domestic Series, 1603–1610*. London, 1857.
- State Trials*. Ed. T. B. Howell. 21 vols. London, 1816, &c.
- Statham, S. P. H. *Dover Charters and other Documents in the Possession of the Corporation of Dover*. London, 1902.
- *History of Dover*. London, 1899.
- Statutes at Large*. Ed. O. Ruffhead and C. Runnington. 14 vols. London, 1786–1800.
- Stavelot, Jean de (1388–1449). *Chronique (1378–1447)*. Ed. A. Borgnet. *Collection de Chroniques Belges inédites*. Brussels, 1861.
- Stein, H. *Claus Sluter l'Aîné et Hannequin de Bar-le-Duc à la Cour de Jean Duc de Berri (1385)*. In *Bibl. Éc. Chartes*, vol. lx. Paris, 1899.
- Stella, J. (d. c. 1435). *Annales Genuenses (1410–1435)*. In *Muratori*, vol. xvii.
- Stengel, E. *John Gower's Minnesang und Ehezuchtbüchlein*. In *Ausgaben und Abhandlungen aus dem Gebiete der romanischen Philologie*, pt. lxiv. Marburg, 1886.
- *Die ältesten Anleitungsschriften zur Erlernung der französischen Sprache*. In *Zeitschrift für neufranzösische Sprache und Litteratur*, vol. i. Oppeln, 1879.
- Stephen, H. J. *New Commentaries on the Laws of England*. 4 vols. London, 1899.
- Stephen, J. F. (1789–1859). *History of the Criminal Law of England*. 3 vols. London, 1883.
- Stephen, K. *French History for Schools*. London, 1899.
- Stephen, L. Swift. In *English Men of Letters*. London, 1882.
- Stephenson, M. *Notes on the Monumental Brasses of Middlesex*. In *Transactions of St Paul's Ecclesiological Society*, vol. iv. London, 1900.
- Stevens, J. *History of Abbeys, Hospitals, Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches*. 2 vols. London, 1722–3.
- Stevenson, J. *Life and Death of King James I of Scotland*. Maitland Club. Edinburgh, 1837.
- *Letters and Papers illustrative of the Wars of the English in France*. R.S. 2 vols. London, 1861–4.
- *Narratives of the Expulsion of the English from Normandy*. R.S. London, 1863.
- Stevenson, R. L. (1850–1894). *Familiar Studies of Men and Books*. London, 1901.
- Stewart, Duncan. *A Short historical and genealogical Account of the Royal Family of Scotland*. Edinburgh, 1739.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 525

- Steyert, A. *Nouvelle Histoire de Lyon*. 3 vols. Lyons, 1895-9.
— *Aperçu sur les Variations du Costume Militaire dans l'Antiquité et au Moyen Age*. Lyons, 1857.
- Stieda, W. *Ein Geldgeschäft Kaiser Sigmunds mit Hänsischen Kaufleuten*. In *Hänsische Geschichtsblätter*, 1887. Leipzig, 1889.
- Stocks, J. E. and Bragg, W. B. *Market Harborough Parish Records*. London, 1890.
- Stone, J. (d. c. 1480). *Chronicle of Christ Church, Canterbury (1415-1471)*. Ed. W. G. Searle. Cambridge, 1902.
- Stone, J. M. *Reformation and Renaissance (1377-1610)*. London, 1904.
- Stonehouse, W. B. *History of the Isle of Axholme*. London, 1839.
- Stothard, C. A. (1787-1821). *Monumental Effigies*. London, 1817.
- Stourton, C. B. J., Baron Mowbray, Segrave, and Stourton. *The History of the Noble House of Stourton*. 2 vols. Stourton, 1899.
- Stow, J. (c. 1525-1605). *A Survey of London*. 2 vols. Ed. C. L. Kingsford. London, 1908. Also ed. W. J. Thoms. London, 1876.
— *The Annales or Generall Chronicle of England*. London, 1615.
— *The Summarie of English Chronicles*. London, 1567.
- Strang, H. *Claud the Archer. A Story of the Reign of Henry the Fifth*. London, 1909.
- Stratmann, F. H. *A Middle-English Dictionary*. Ed. H. Bradley. Oxford, 1891.
- Strickland, Agnes. *Queens of England*. 6 vols. London, 1868.
- Strutt, J. (1749-1802). *Compleat View of the Manners, Customs, Arms, etc. of the Inhabitants of England*. 3 vols. London, 1775-6.
— *Regal and Ecclesiastical Antiquities of England*. London, 1793.
— *Sports and Pastimes of the People of England*. London, 1801.
- Stubbs, W. *Constitutional History of England*. 3 vols. Oxford, 1880.
— *Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum*. Oxford, 1858.
— *Germany in the later Middle Ages (1200-1500)*. Ed. A. Hassall. London, 1908.
- Suchier, H. and Birch-Hirschfeld, A. *Geschichte der französischen Litteratur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart*. Leipzig, 1900.
- Summonte, G. A. (d. 1602). *Historia della Città e Regno di Napoli*. 4 vols. Naples, 1602-43.
- Surita, Geronimo (1512-1580). *Anales de la Corona de Aragon*. 2 vols. Madrid, 1853.
— *Indices rerum ab Aragoniae regibus gestarum*. Saragossa, 1578.
- Surius, L. (1522-1578). *Il Camposanto di Pisa*. Florence, 1896.
- Surtees, R. (1779-1834). *History of Durham*. 4 vols. London, 1816, &c.
- Sussex Archaeological Society. *Archaeological Collections*. London, 1848, &c.
- Sveyro, Em. *Annales de Flandres*. 2 vols. Antwerp, 1624.
- Swallow, H. J. *De Nova Villa; or, the House of Nevill*. Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1885.
— *The Catherines of History*. Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1888.
- Swift, J. (1667-1745). *Works*. Ed. Sir Walter Scott. 19 vols. London, 1824.
- Sylvestre, T. *Engravings of Fortified Towns*. 1662.
- Szazadok. Pest, 1867, &c.
- Taillepiéd, N. (c. 1540-1588). *Les Antiquités et Singularités de la Ville de Rouen*. Ed. A. Tougard. Rouen, 1901.
- Tanner, T. (1674-1735). *Bibliotheca Britanno-Hibernica*. London, 1748.
- Tarbé, P. *Les Lépreux à Rheims*. Rheims, 1842.

526 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Tardieu, A. Histoire de la Ville de Clermont-Ferrand. 2 vols. Moulins, 1870-2.
 — Histoire de la Ville de Montferrand. Moulins, 1875.
 — Histoire de la Ville, du Pays, et de la Baronnie d'Herment en Auvergne. Clermont-Ferrand, 1866.
 — L'Auvergne (Puy-de-Dôme), Guide Complet Illustré. Herment, 1886.
 — Grand Dictionnaire historique du Département du Puy-de-Dôme. Moulins, 1877.
- Tate, G. Antiquities of Yevinger Bell. Alnwick, 1862.
- Taylor, E. Lays of the Minnesingers. London, 1825.
- Taylor, G. W. Poems written in English by Charles Duke of Orleans during his Captivity in England. Roxburghe Club. London, 1827.
- Taylor, T. Historical and Topographical Description of the Village and Castle of Farley. London, 1839.
- Teoli, A. Storia della vita e del culto di S. Vincenzo Ferrerio. Naples, 1843.
- Terrasson, A. (1705-1782). Mélanges d'Histoire, de Littérature, de Jurisprudence littéraire, etc. Paris, 1768.
- Tessereau, A. Histoire chronologique de la grande Chancellerie de France. 2 vols. Paris, 1710.
- Testamenta Eboracensia. Ed. J. Raine. Surtees Soc. 6 vols. Durham, 1836, &c. [Thalamus.] Le Petit Thalamus de Montpellier. Montpellier, 1844.
- Thatcher, O. J. J. and Schwill, F. Europe in the Middle Age. London, 1897.
- Thaumas de la Thaumassière, G. (1621-1702). Histoire de Berry. 4 vols. Bourges, 1865-71.
- Thenaud, J. (d. after 1523). Le Voyage d'Outremer. Ed. C. Schaefer. Paris, 1884.
- Thevenot, E. H. Essai historique sur le Vitrail. Clermont-Ferrand, 1837.
- Thevet, A. Pourtraits et vies des Hommes illustres. 2 vols. Paris, 1584.
- Thibaudeau, A. R. H. (1739-1813). Histoire du Poitou. Ed. H. de St Hermine. 3 vols. Niort, 1839.
- Thibault, M. Isabeau de Bavière. Paris, 1903.
- Thierry, J. N. A. Recueil des Monuments inédits de l'histoire du Tiers État. 4 vols. Paris, 1850-70.
 — Essai sur l'histoire de la Formation et du Progrès du Tiers État. Paris, 1866.
- Tholin, G. Inventaire sommaire des Archives communales: Ville d'Agen. Paris, 1884.
 — Ville libre et barons. Essai sur les Limites de la Juridiction d'Agen. Agen, 1886.
- Thomas, A. St Vincent Ferrier dans le midi de la France. In Annales du Midi, vol. iv. Toulouse, 1892.
 — Soldats Italiens au service de la France en 1417. Ibid.
 — Les États Provinciaux de la France centrale sous Charles VII. 2 vols. Paris, 1879.
 — De Johannis de Monsterolio Vita et Operibus. Paris, 1883.
 — Le Dauphin Louis, fils de Charles VI, amateur de Théâtre. In Romania, vol. xxxix. Paris, 1910.
- Thomas, T. Memoirs of Owen Glendower. Haverfordwest, 1822.
- Thomassy, R. Jean Gerson. Paris, 1843.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 527

- Thompson, E. M. Notes on illuminated MSS. in the Exhibition of English Mediaeval Paintings. In Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London, ser. 11, vol. xvi. London, 1896.
- Thompson, T. Ocellum Promontorium; or short Observations on the ancient State of Holderness. Hull, 1824.
- Thomson, C. L. Historical Albums. 6 pts. London, 1903.
- Thoroton, R. Antiquities of Nottinghamshire. Ed. J. Thoresby. 3 vols. London, 1797.
- Thorpe, B. (1782-1870). Ancient Laws and Institutes of England. London, 1840.
- Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles. Ed. J. Gairdner. Camden Soc. London, 1880.
- Thureau-Dangin, P. Un Prédicateur Populaire. St Bernardin de Sienne. Paris, 1896.
- Tickell, J. History of the Town and County of Kingston-upon-Hull. Hull, 1798.
- Tierney, M. A. History of the Town and Castle of Arundel. 2 vols. London, 1834.
- Tighe, R. R. and Davis, J. E. Annals of Windsor. 2 vols. London, 1858.
- Tillet, Jean du (c. 1500-1570). Recueil des Rois de France. Paris, 1618.
- Guerres et Traictez de Paix. Paris, 1588.
- Tilloy, O. Histoire de Jean-sans-Peur Duc de Bourgogne. Douai, 1861.
- Tindal. *See* Rapin-Thoyras.
- Tinodi, S. (d. 1558). Összes Művei (1540-1555). Ed. Á. Szilády. In Régi Magyar Költők tára, vol. iii. Pest, 1881.
- Tisserand, L. M. Les Armoires de la Ville de Paris. 2 vols. Paris, 1874-5.
- Titi Livii Foro-Julienensis Vita Henrici Quinti. Ed. T. Hearne. Oxford, 1716.
- Tivier, H. Histoire de la Littérature française. Paris, 1879.
- Histoire de la Littérature dramatique en France depuis ses Origines jusqu'au Cid. Paris, 1873.
- Tollet, G. De l'Assistance Publique et des Hôpitaux jusqu'au XIX^e siècle. Paris, 1889.
- Tolra de Bordas, J. L'Antipape Benoît XIII en Roussillon. In Revue du Monde Catholique, vol. xv. Paris, 1866.
- [Top. and Gen.] The Topographer and Genealogist. Ed. J. G. Nichols. 3 vols. 1846-58.
- Topham, J. (1746-1803). Some Account of the Collegiate Church of St Stephen. London, 1798.
- Touchard-Lafosse, G. Histoire de Blois. Blois, 1846.
- Toulgoët-Treanna, E. de. Les Comptes de l'Hôtel du Duc de Berry (1370-1413). In Mémoires de la Soc. des Antiquaires du Centre, vol. xvii. Bourges, 1890.
- Tour-Landry, La, The book of the Knight of. Ed. T. Wright. E.E.T.S. London, 1868.
- Touron, A. Histoire des Hommes Illustres de l'Ordre de St Dominique. 6 vols. Paris, 1743-9.
- Tout, T. F. An Advanced History of Great Britain. London, 1906.
- Firearms in England in the Fourteenth Century. In English Historical Review, vol. xxvi. London, 1911.
- Towle, G. M. History of Henry V. New York, 1866.
- Townley Mysteries. Surtees Soc. Durham, 1836.

528 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- [Trahisons.] *Le Livre des Trahisons de France envers la Maison de Bourgogne* (1389-1470). In *Chroniques relatives à l'Hist. de Belgique sous la domination des ducs de Bourgogne*, vol. ii. Brussels, 1870.
- Traill, H. D. *Social England*. 6 vols. London, 1893-7.
- [Traison.] *Chronique de la Traison et mort de Richard II*. Ed. B. Williams. English Historical Soc. London, 1846.
- Travers, N. (1686-1750). *Histoire civile, politique et religieuse de la Ville et du Comté de Nantes*. 3 vols. Nantes, 1836-41.
- Trébuchet, L. *Un Compagnon de Jeanne d'Arc, Artur III, Comte de Richemont*. Paris, 1897.
- Trébutien, F. G. S. (1800-1870). *Caen, son Histoire, ses Monuments, son Commerce et ses Environs*. Caen, 1881.
- Trémoille. *See* La Trémoille.
- Trench, W. F. *A Mirror for Magistrates: its Origin and Influence*. Edinburgh, 1898.
- Trévédy, J. *Le Connétable de Richemont*. Vannes, 1900.
- Trevelyan, G. M. *England in the Age of Wycliffe*. London, 1899.
- Triger, R. *Une forteresse du Maine pendant l'occupation anglaise*. Mamers, 1886.
- *Le Château et la ville de Beaumont-le-Vicomte pendant l'invasion anglaise* (1417-1450). Mamers, 1901.
- Trithem, J. *Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum sive illustrium virorum*. Cologne, 1531.
- Trokelow, Johannes de. *Chronicon*. Ed. H. T. Riley. R.S. London, 1866.
- Trou, D. (d. 1856). *Recherches historiques, archéologiques, et biographiques sur la Ville de Pontoise*. Pontoise, 1841.
- Truschet, O. and Hoyau, G. *Plan de Paris sous le Règne de Henri II*. Paris, 1877.
- Trussell, J. *A Continuation of the Collection of the History of England* [by Samuel Daniell]. London, 1636.
- Tuetey, A. *Testaments enregistrés au Parlement de Paris sous le règne de Charles VI*. In *Collection de Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France. Mélanges*, vol. iii. Paris, 1880.
- Turmair (or Aventinus), J. (1477-1534). *Sämmtliche Werke*. Ed. C. von Halm. 5 vols. Munich, 1880-6.
- Turner, Dawson (1775-1858). *Account of a Tour in Normandy*. 2 vols. London, 1820.
- *Sketch of the History of Caister castle*. London, 1842.
- Turner, G. J. *Select Pleas of the Forest*. Selden Soc. London, 1901.
- *Lincoln's Inn*. London, 1901.
- Turner, S. *History of England*. 5 vols. London, 1830.
- Turner, T. H. (1815-1852). *Some Account of Domestic Architecture in England*. Ed. J. H. Parker. 4 vols. Oxford, 1851-9.
- Twinger von Königshofen, J. (1349-1420). *Chronik*. Ed. C. Hegel. In *Chroniken der deutschen Städte*. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1870-1.
- Two Fifteenth-century Cookery-Books*. Ed. T. Austin. E.E.T.S. London, 1888.
- Twysden, R. *Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores Decem*. London, 1652.
- Tyler, J. Endell. *Henry of Monmouth*. 2 vols. London, 1838.
- Tyrrell, H. *History of England for Family Use*. 2 vols. London, 1872-3.
Reprinted as *The Royal History of England*. London, 1876.
- Tytler, P. F. *Lives of Scottish Worthies*. 3 vols. London, 1831-2.
- *History of Scotland*. 4 vols. Edinburgh, 1873-7.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 529

- Upton, N. (c. 1410-1457). *De Studio militari*. Ed. E. Bysshe. London, 1654.
- Urry, J. *The works of G. Chaucer*. London, 1721.
- Usk, Adam of (c. 1352-1430). *Chronicon* (1377-1421). Ed. E. M. Thompson. London, 1904.
- Vaissète. *See* Vic.
- Valdory, G. (d. 1601). *Relation du Siège de Rouen en 1591*. Ed. E. Gosselin. Rouen, 1881.
- Valla, L. (1405-1457). *De Rebus a Ferdinando Aragoniæ rege gestis*. In *Rerum Hispanicarum Scriptorum*, vol. ii. Frankfort, 1579.
- Vallée, Ph. *Inventaire sommaire des Archives communales: Ville de Dijon*. Dijon, 1900.
- Vallet de Virville, A. (1815-1868). *Histoire de Charles VII*. 3 vols. Paris, 1862-5.
- *Extraits des Comptes Royaux relatifs à Charles VII*. In *Cabinet Historique*, vol. iii. Paris, 1857.
- *Isabeau de Bavière*. In *Revue Française*, vol. xv. Paris, 1859.
- *Assassinat du Duc d'Orléans par Jean sans Peur*. In *Magasin de Librairie*, vol. vii. Paris, 1859.
- *Les derniers Jours de Valentine de Milan*. In *Revue Française*, vol. xvii. Paris, 1859.
- *Histoire de l'Instruction Publique en Europe*. Paris, 1849.
- *Charles VII, Roi de France et ses Conseillers* (1403-1461). Paris, 1859.
- *Notes sur deux Médailles de Plomb relatives à Jeanne d'Arc*. In *Revue Archéologique*. Paris, 1861.
- *Notices de quelques Manuscrits précieux sous le Rapport de l'Art*. In *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, vols. xx, xxi. Paris, 1866.
- Valois, N. *Le Conseil du Roi aux xiv^e, xv^e et xvi^e siècles*. Paris, 1888.
- *La France et le grand Schisme d'Occident*. 4 vols. Paris, 1896-1902.
- Vandenbroeck, H. *Extraits analytiques des anciens Registres des Consaux de la Ville de Tournai* (1385-1422). 2 vols. Tournai, 1861-3.
- Vapereau, L. G. *Dictionnaire universel des Littératures*. Paris, 1876-7.
- Varenbergh, E. *Histoire des relations diplomatiques entre le Comté de Flandre et l'Angleterre*. Brussels, 1874.
- Varillas, A. *Histoire des Révolutions arrivées dans l'Europe en matière de Religion*. 6 vols. Paris, 1686-9.
- Vatout, J. (1792-1848). *Souvenirs historiques des Résidences Royales de France*. 7 vols. Paris, 1837-45.
- *Le Château d'Eu illustré*. Paris, 1844.
- Vattier, V. *John Wycliff, sa vie, ses œuvres, sa doctrine*. Paris, 1886.
- Vaultier, M. C. F. E. (1772-1843). *Histoire de la Ville de Caen*. Caen, 1843.
- *Recherches historiques sur l'ancien Doyenné de Vaucelles*. In *Mém. Soc. des Antiquaires de la Normandie*, vol. xii. Caen, 1841.
- Vautier, C. *Extrait du Registre des Dons, Confiscations, Maintenues et autres Actes faits dans le Duché de Normandie pendant les Années 1418-1420 par Henri V Roi d'Angleterre*. Paris, 1828.
- Vaux de Vire. *See* Gasté.
- Veer, G. de. *Prinz Heinrich der Seefahrer und seine Zeit*. Danzig, 1864.
- [Ven. State Papers.] *Calendar of State Papers relating to English affairs in the Archives of Venice*. London, 1864, &c.
- Venn, J. *Biographical History of Gonville and Caius College*. 4 vols. Cambridge, 1897-1912.

530 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Venturi, A. *Storia dell' Arte Italiana*. Milan, 1901, &c.
- Venuti, F. *Dissertations sur les anciens monuments de la ville de Bordeaux, sur les Gahets, les antiquités, et les ducs d'Aquitaine; avec un traité historique sur les monnoyes que les Anglais ont frappés dans cette province*. Bordeaux, 1754.
- Verdier, A. and Cattois, F. *Architecture civile et domestique au Moyen Age et à la Renaissance*. 2 vols. Paris, 1855-7.
- Verhaer (or Haraeus), F. *Annales ducum seu Principum Brabantiae totiusque Belgii*. 3 vols. Antwerp, 1623.
- Vermis, Miguel del. *Chronique dels Comtes de Foix et Senhors de Béarn*. Ed. J. A. C. Buchon. In *Panthéon Littéraire*. Paris, 1835-45.
- Verneuil, *Chronique d'un Bourgeois de*. In *Bulletin de la Soc. hist. de Normandie*, vol. iii. Also ed. A. Hellot. Paris, 1884.
- Vic, C. de, and Vaissète, J. J. *Histoire générale de Languedoc*. 16 vols. Toulouse, 1872-1905.
- Viciana, M. de (1502-1566). *Chronica de Valencia*. 2 vols. Valencia, 1881-4.
- Vickers, K. H. Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester. London, 1907.
- *England in the Later Middle Ages*. London, 1913.
- [*Vict. Hist.*] *Victoria History of the Counties of England*. Ed. H. A. Doubleday and W. Page. London, 1894, &c.
- Vidal, P. *Elne historique et archéologique*. Perpignan, 1887.
- Vidier, A. *Notes et Documents sur le Personnel, les Biens, et l'Administration de la Sainte Chapelle du xiii^e au xv^e siècle*. In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. xxviii. Paris, 1902.
- Vignat, E. *Les Lépreux et les Chevaliers de St Lazare de Jérusalem et de N.D. du Mont Carmel*. Orléans, 1844.
- Vigne, F. de. *Vade Mecum du Peintre, ou Recueil de Costumes du Moyen Age*. 2 vols. Ghent, 1835-40.
- *Recherches historiques sur les Costumes civiles et militaires des Gildes et des Corporations de Métiers*. Ghent, 1847.
- *Mœurs et Usages des Corporations de Métiers de la Belgique et du Nord de la France*. Ghent, 1857.
- Vignier, N. (1530-1596). *Histoire de la Maison de Luxembourg*. Paris, 1617.
- *Rerum Burgundionum Chronicon*. Basle, 1575.
- *Recueil de l'Histoire de l'Église*. Leyden, 1601.
- Villain, E. F. *Essai d'une Histoire de la Paroisse de St Jacques de la Boucherie*. Paris, 1758.
- *Histoire Critique de Nicolas Flamel et de Pernelle sa Femme*. Paris, 1761.
- Villard de Honnecourt (c. 1250). *Album*. Ed. J. B. A. Lassus. Paris, 1856.
- Ed. R. Willis. London, 1859. Facsimile reproduction. Ed. H. Omont. Paris, 1906.
- Villaret, C. (1715-1766). *Histoire de France*. 33 vols. Paris, 1763.
- Villari, L. *Oswald von Wolkenstein*. London, 1901.
- Villemain, A. F. *Cours de Littérature française*. 5 vols. Paris, 1829-38.
- Villeneuve-Bargemont, F. L. de. *Histoire de René d'Anjou*. 3 vols. Paris, 1825.
- Villerabel, A. du Bois de la. *À Travers le vieux St Brieuc*. St Brieuc, 1891.
- Villien de St Étienne, C. *Bibliotheca Carmelitana*. 2 vols. Orléans, 1752.
- Vinchant, F. (1580-1635). *Annales de la Province et Comté du Hainaut*. 6 vols. Brussels, 1848-53.
- Viолlet, P. *Quelques Textes pour servir à l'Histoire politique des Parisiens au xv^e siècle*. In *Mém. Soc. de l'Hist. de Paris*, vol. ii. Paris, 1878.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 531

- Viollet, P. Histoire du Droit Civil français. Paris, 1893.
— Histoire des Institutions politiques et administratives de la France. 4 vols. Paris, 1890-1912.
Viollet-le-Duc, E. E. Dictionnaire raisonné du Mobilier Français. 6 vols. Paris, 1855-75.
— Dictionnaire de l'Architecture Française. 10 vols. Paris, 1865-8.
— Album de Villard de Honnecourt. In *Revue Archéologique* (N.S.), vol. vii. Paris, 1863.
Virac, D. A. Recherches historiques sur la Ville de St Macaire. Bordeaux, 1890.
[Vita.] Vita et Gesta Henrici Quinti. Ed. T. Hearne. Oxford, 1727.
Vitry, Jacques de (c. 1178-1240). *Historia Orientalis et Occidentalis*. Douai, 1597.
Voigt, F. Geschichte des brandenburgisch-preussischen Staates. Berlin, 1860.
Voigt, G. (1827-1891). Die Wiederbelebung des Classischen Alterthums. 2 vols. Berlin, 1880.
Voigt, J. Geschichte Marienburgs. Königsberg, 1843.
— Namen-Codex der deutschen Ordens-Beamten. Königsberg, 1843.
Voisin-La Hougue. Histoire de la Ville de Cherbourg. Ed. "Verusmor." Cherbourg, 1835.
Vossberg, F. A. (1800-1870). *Banderia Prutenorum, oder die Fahnen des deutschen Ordens und seiner Verbündeten, welche in Schlachten und Gefechten des 15en Jahrhunderts eine Beute der Polen wurden*. Berlin, 1849.
— Geschichte der preussischen Münzen und Siegel bis zum Ende der Herrschaft des deutschen Ordens. Berlin, 1843.
Vossius, M. (d. 1646). *Annales Hollandiae Zelandiaeque*. Amsterdam, 1680.
Vowell (or Hooker), J. (c. 1526-1601). *A Catalog of the Bishops of Excester*. London, 1584.
Wade, J. *British History chronologically arranged*. London, 1844.
Wagenaar, J. (1709-1773). *Vaterlandsche Historie*. 21 vols. Amsterdam, 1749-59. 2 vols. Amsterdam, 1792-1800.
Wake, W. (1657-1737). *State of the Church and Clergy of England*. London, 1703.
Wakeman, H. O. *An Introduction to the History of the Church of England*. London, 1899.
Walcott, M. E. C. (1821-1880). *Memorials of Westminster*. London, 1851.
— *Memorials of Canterbury*. Canterbury, 1868.
— *Inventory of St Osythe's Priory, Essex*. London, 1870.
— *Prices and Alien Priors*. In *Reliquary*, July, 1870.
— *Vestiges of St Augustine's Abbey without the Walls of Canterbury*. In *Journal of British Archæological Association*, vol. xxxv. London, 1879.
Walden. *See* Netter.
Waller, J. G. and L. A. B. *A Series of Monumental Brasses from the 13th to the 16th Century*. London, 1864.
Wallis, J. *The Natural History and Antiquities of Northumberland*. 2 vols. London, 1769.
Wallon, H. A. *Jeanne d'Arc*. Paris, 1883.
Walpole, H. (1717-1797). *Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors*. 5 vols. London, 1806.
Walsler, E. *Poggius Florentinus' Leben und Werke*. Leipzig and Berlin, 1914.

532 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Walsingham, Thomas. *Historia Anglicana*. Ed. H. T. Riley. R.S. 2 vols. London, 1863-4.
- *Hypodigma Neustriae*. Ed. H. T. Riley. R.S. London, 1876.
- Ward, H. L. D. *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum*. 2 vols. London, 1883, 1893.
- Ware, J. *Works concerning Ireland*. Ed. W. Harris. 2 vols. Dublin, 1764.
- Warner, B. E. *English History in Shakespeare's Plays*. New York, 1894.
- Warner, G. F. *Guide to Manuscript Autographs exhibited in the Department of MSS. of the British Museum*. London, 1906.
- *Reproductions from Illuminated MSS*. 3 vols. London, 1907.
- *Illuminated MSS. in the British Museum, ser. I-IV*. London, 1903.
- *Valerius Maximus. Miniatures illustrating the French Version in a Manuscript written about 1475*. London, 1907.
- Warner, G. T. *A Brief Survey of British History*. London, 1899.
- Warner, R. *Collections for the History of Hampshire*. 6 vols. London, 1795.
- Warnke, C. *Die Quellen des Epose der Marie de France*. In *Festgabe für H. Suchier*. Halle, 1890.
- *Die Fabeln der Marie de France*. Halle, 1898.
- Warton, T. (1728-1790). *History of English Poetry*. Ed. W. Carew Hazlitt. 4 vols. London, 1871.
- Wassebourg, R. (c. 1480). *Premier Volume des Antiquitez de la Gaule Belgique, Royaume de France, Auustrasie et Lorraine*. 2 vols. Paris, 1549.
- Waterland, D. (1683-1740). *Works*. 11 vols. Oxford, 1823.
- Waters, E. C. *The Counts of Eu sometime Lords of the Honor of Tickhill*. In *Yorkshire Archæological and Topographical Journal*, vol. ix. London, 1886.
- Watson, Chr. (d. 1581). *The Victorious Actes of King Henry the Fifth*. London, 1568.
- Watt (or Vadian), Joachim von (1484-1551). *Chronik der Aebte des Klosters St Gallen*. Ed. E. Götzinger. 2 vols. St Gall, 1875-7.
- Wattenbach, W. *Verse aus England*. In *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, vol. i. Hanover, 1876.
- Waugh, W. T. *Sir John Oldcastle*. In *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, vol. xx. London, 1905.
- Waurin, Jehan de (c. 1390-1474). *Recueil des Chroniques*. Ed. W. Hardy and E. L. C. P. Hardy. R.S. 5 vols. London, 1864-91.
- Way, G. L. *Fabliaux or Tales selected and translated*. London, 1815.
- Weale, W. H. J. *Hubert and John Van Eyck; their Life and Work*. London, 1908.
- Webb, J. (1776-1869). *Roll of Household Expenses of Richard de Swinefield, bishop of Hereford, 1289-1290*. 2 vols. Camden Soc. London, 1854-5.
- Weekes, E. Lega. *The King's Old Bargehouse*. In *Home Counties Magazine*, vol. x. London, 1908.
- Weever, J. *Ancient Funeral Monuments*. London, 1631.
- Weiss, H. *Kostümkunde. Geschichte der Tracht und des Geräthes vom xivten Jahrhundert bis auf die Gegenwart*. 2 vols. Stuttgart, 1872.
- [*Welsh Manuscripts.*] *Reports of MSS. in the Welsh Language. Historical MSS. Commission*. 2 vols. London, 1898, 1910.
- Wenck, K. *Lucia Visconti. König Heinrich IV von England und Edmund von Kent*. In *Mitt. des Inst. für Oesterr. Geschichtsforschung*, vol. xviii. Innsbruck, 1897.
- Wenzelburger, K. Th. *Geschichte der Niederlande*. Gotha, 1879.
- Werth, H. *Altfranzösische Jagdlehrbücher*. Halle, 1889.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 533

- Westcott, B. F. *A General View of the history of the English Bible*. London, 1905.
- Westlake, H. F. *Westminster Abbey*. London, 1923.
- Westlake, N. H. J. *A History of Design in Painted Glass*. 4 vols. London, 1879-94.
- Wetzer, H. J. and Welte, B. *Kirchenlexicon oder Encyclopädie der Katholischen Theologie*. 12 vols. Freiburg-i.-B., 1886-1901.
- Wharton, H. (1664-1695). *Historia Literaria*. In Appendix to W. Cave, *Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Historia Literaria*. London, 1689.
- Wheater, W. *History of the Parishes of Sherburn and Cawood with notices of Wistow, Saxton, Towton, etc.* London, 1882.
- Wheatley, H. B. *London, Past and Present*. 3 vols. London, 1897.
- Whethamstede, T. *Duo rerum Anglicarum Scriptores*. Ed. T. Hearne. Oxford, 1732.
- Whitaker, T. D. (1759-1821). *History and Antiquities of Craven*. Leeds, 1878.
- *Loidis and Elmete*. Leeds, 1816.
- *History of Whalley*. 2 vols. London, 1872.
- Whitford, R. (b. 1542). *The Martiloge in Englyshe*. Ed. F. Procter and E. S. Dewick. Henry Bradshaw Soc. London, 1893.
- Whitwell, R. J. *Italian Bankers and the English Crown*. In *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. II. vol. xvii. London, 1903.
- Widmore, R. *An History of the Church of St Peter, Westminster*. London, 1751.
- Wilkes, J. *Encyclopædia Londinensis*. 24 vols. London, 1810-29.
- Wilkinson, R. *Londina Illustrata*. 2 vols. London, 1819.
- Willemin, N. X. Z. (1763-1830). *Monuments français inédits pour servir à l'histoire des Arts*. 2 vols. Paris, 1836-9.
- Williams, R. F. *Domestic Memoirs of the Royal Family and of the Court of England*. 3 vols. London, 1860.
- Willis, Browne. *History of the Mitred Parliamentary Abbies*. 2 vols. London, 1718, 1719.
- Willis, R. *The Architectural History of the conventual buildings of the Monastery of Christ Church in Canterbury*. In *Archæologia Cantiana*, vol. vii. London, 1868.
- *The Architectural History of the University of Cambridge*. Ed. J. W. Clark. 4 vols. Cambridge, 1886.
- Wills of Kings and Queens of England*, Collection of. Ed. J. Nichols. London, 1780.
- Wilson, H. B. (1774-1853). *History of the Parish of St Laurence Pountney*. London, 1831.
- Wilson, L. *The New Testament translated by John Wycliffe*. London, 1848.
- Windecke, E. (1380-1443). *Denkwürdigkeiten*. Ed. W. Altmann. Berlin, 1893.
- Windle, B. C. A. *A School History of Warwickshire*. London, 1905.
- Wolf, F. *Studien zur Geschichte der Spanischen und Portugiesischen National-literatur*. Berlin, 1859.
- Wolff, M. von. *Leben und Werke des Antonio Beccadelli genannt Panormita*. Leipzig, 1894.
- Wolkenstein, O. (1367-1445). *Gedichte*. Ed. J. Schatz. Göttingen, 1904.
- Woltmann, A. *Holbein und seine Zeit*. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1866-8.
- *Geschichte der Malerei*. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1879-88. Translated by S. Colvin and C. Bell. London, 1880.

534 *List of Printed Books to which reference is made*

- Wood, Antony à (1632-1695). *History and Antiquities of the Colleges and Halls in the University of Oxford*. Ed. J. Gutch. 2 vols. Oxford, 1786-90.
- Wood, M. A. E. *Letters of Royal and Illustrious Ladies*. 3 vols. London, 1846.
- Woodward, B. B., Wilks, T. C. and Lockhart, C. *History of Hampshire*. 3 vols. London, 1861-9.
- Woolnoth, W. *A Graphical Illustration of the Metropolitan Cathedral of Canterbury*. London, 1810.
- Worcester, William (1415-1482). *Itinerarium*. Ed. J. Nasmith. Cambridge, 1778.
- *Annales rerum Anglicarum*. Ed. T. Hearne in *Liber niger Scaccarii*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1728.
- Wordsworth, Chr. (1774-1846). *Ecclesiastical Biography*. 4 vols. London, 1839.
- Wordsworth, Chr. (b. 1848). *The Fifteenth Century Cartulary of St Nicholas' Hospital, Salisbury*. Salisbury, 1902.
- Workman, H. B. *The Dawn of the Reformation*. 2 vols. London, 1901-2.
- *John Wyclif*. 2 vols. Oxford, 1926.
- Wornum, R. N. *Some Account of the Life and Works of Hans Holbein the Younger*. London, 1867.
- Worthy, C. *History of the Suburbs of Exeter*. London, 1892.
- *Devonshire Wills*. London, 1896.
- Wratislaw, A. H. *John Hus*. London, 1882.
- Wright, A. and Smith, P. *Parliament Past and Present*. London, 1908.
- Wright, James. *The History and Antiquities of the County of Rutland*. London, 1684-7.
- Wright, Joseph. *English Dialect Dictionary*. 6 vols. London, 1896-1905.
- Wright, Thomas. (1810-1877). *History and Topography of the County of Essex*. 2 vols. London, 1831-5.
- *History of France*. 3 vols. London, 1858-62.
- *History of Domestic Manners and Sentiments in England during the Middle Ages*. London, 1862.
- *Feudal Manuals of English History*. London, 1872.
- *Songs and Carols from a Manuscript of the 15th Century*. Percy Society. London, 1847.
- Wright, T. *Views of Westminster Abbey*. London, 1896.
- Wrottesley, G. *Crecy and Calais*. London, 1898.
- Wuerdinger, J. *Kriegsgeschichte von Bayern, Franken, Pfalz und Schwaben (1347-1526)*. 2 vols. Munich, 1868.
- Wuerth-Pacquet, F. X. (1801-1884). *Table chronologique des Chartes et Diplômes relatifs à l'Histoire de l'ancien Pays de Luxembourg (1385-1419)*. In *Publications de la Section Historique de l'Institut de Luxembourg*, vol. xxv. Luxembourg, 1885.
- Wurzbach, C. *Biographisches Lexicon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*. Vienna, 1856-91.
- Wusterwitz, E. (c. 1375-1433) *Märkische Chronik*. Ed. J. Heidemann. Berlin, 1878.
- Wylie, J. H. (1844-1914). *History of England under Henry IV*. 4 vols. London, 1884-98.
- *The Council of Constance to the Death of John Hus*. London, 1900.
- *Notes on the Agincourt Roll*. In *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, ser. III, vol. v. London, 1911.

List of Printed Books to which reference is made 535

- Wyon, A. B. (1837-1884). *The Great Seals of England*. London, 1887.
- Yeatman, J. P. *The Feudal History of the County of Derby*. 3 vols. Kingston-on-Thames, 1886-95.
- Yonge, C. M. *Cameos from English History*. 2nd ser. London, 1871.
- *History of Christian Names*. 2 vols. London, 1863.
- York, Edward Duke of (1373-1415). *The Master of Game*. Ed. W. A. and F. Baillie-Grohman. London, 1904.
- York Mystery Plays. Ed. L. T. Smith. Oxford, 1885.
- York Pontifical, *i.e.* *Liber Pontificalis C. Bainbridge archiepiscopi Eboracensis*. Ed. W. G. Henderson. Surtees Soc. Durham, 1875.
- Yorkshire Archæological and Topographical Journal. London, 1878, &c.
- Young, S. *The Annals of the Barber-Surgeons of London*. London, 1890.
- Yriarte, C. *Un Condottiere au xv^e siècle*. Paris, 1882.
- *Florence*. Paris, 1881.
- Yule. *See* Marco Polo.
- Zantfliet, Cornelius (d. after 1461). *Chronicon*. In Martène, *Collectio*, vol. v.
- Zech, K. L. F. von (1790-1829). *Die merkwürdigsten Schlachten zwischen Franzosen und Engländern*. In *Oesterreichische militärische Zeitschrift*, vol. ix. Vienna, 1835.
- Zeiler, M. *Topographia Galliae*. 3 vols. Frankfurt, 1655-61.
- Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*. Gotha, 1876, &c.
- Zeller, B. *La France Anglaise*. Paris, 1886.
- *Les Armagnacs et les Bourguignons*. Paris, 1886.
- *Louis de France et Jean-Sans-Peur*. Paris, 1886.
- *La Grande Invasion Anglaise*. Paris, 1885.
- Zeller, J. *Histoire d'Allemagne*. 7 vols. Paris, 1872-91.
- *Histoire de l'Italie*. Paris, 1853.
- Zimmern, H. *The Hansa Towns*. London, 1889.
- Zuercher, J. *Gersons Stellung auf dem Concile von Constanz*. In M. Buedinger, *Untersuchungen zur mittlern Geschichte*, vol. ii. Leipzig, 1871.

LIST OF MANUSCRIPT AUTHORITIES USED

At the Public Record Office, London.

Chancery Records.

Close Rolls; Fine Rolls; French (or Treaty) Rolls; Gascon Rolls; Norman Rolls; Patent Rolls; Warrants for the Great Seal, Ser. 1 (sometimes cited by Dr Wylie as "Privy Seal"); Inquisitions *ad quod damnum*; Inquisitions *post mortem*.

Exchequer Records.

The King's Remembrancer:

Accounts, Various; Memoranda Rolls; Miscellaneous Books, Ser. 1.

The Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer:

Foreign Accounts; Memoranda Rolls; Miscellaneous Enrolled Accounts.

Exchequer of Receipt:

Issue Rolls; Receipt Rolls.

Duchy of Lancaster Records.

Accounts, Various.

Special Collections.

Ancient Correspondence.

Collections of Transcripts.

Transcripts of Foreign Records (Record Commission Transcripts, Ser. 11).

In the British Museum.

Additional MSS.:

4600, 4601, 4602, 4603, 4660, 7096 and 14848 (Reg. of Abbot Curteys), 17716, 24062, 24512, 24513, 24704, 29704, 35295 (Strecche's *Historia Regum Anglie*), 37967.

Cotton MSS.:

Julius B i, B ii, C vii, E iv; Tiberius B vi, B xii; Caligula D iii, D v, D vii; Claudius A viii, E iv; Nero D vi; Otho B xiv, E ix; Vitellius E xii; Vespasian C xii; Titus C ix; Cleopatra C iv, E ii, F iii, F vi.

Egerton MS. 1995.

Harley MSS.:

293, 431, 565, 782, 864, 991, 1309, 3838, 4205, 4379, 4380, 4381, 4763, 6953.

Lansdowne MSS.:

762, 1054.

In the British Museum (*continued*).

Royal MSS.:

1 E ix, 16 F ii, 20 C vii, 20 E ix.

Sloane MS. 1776.

Stowe MS. 440.

Additional Charters:

11, 50, 52, 59, 65, 66, 67, 111, 260, 452, 2101, 2139, 2140, 2141,
2144, 2155, 2292, 2305, 2326, 2425, 2429, 2439, 2440, 11474,
12508, 13344, 13345, 16368 C, 17716.

Harley Charter 43 E 39.

At the College of Arms.

Arundel MS. 29.

MS. M 9 (Chronicle of Basset, etc.).

At Lambeth Palace.

Lambeth MS. 84.

Registers of Archbishops Arundel and Chichele.

In the Bodleian Library.

Bodleian MSS.:

496, 2159.

At Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Arderne MS.

At the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

MSS. français:

Ancien fonds, 25766, 25907, 26043, 26044; nouvelles acquisitions,
1482.

Portefeuilles de Fontanicu, 111-112.

In the Library of Harvard University.

Typescript, HU 90.1215 (Professor Newhall's thesis).

Miscellaneous.

Exeter Municipal Records.

Salisbury Ledgers.

Register of Thomas Langley, Bishop of Durham.

Maldon Rolls.

Dr A. Clark's notes on the rolls of the manors of Great Waltham and
Chatham Hall.

INDEX

- Aa, river, 27
Aachen, 31
Abbeville (Somme), 6, 24, 129, 227, 295,
321, 333, 334, 421
Abbotsbury (Dorset), abbey of, 42
Abergavenny, Lord, see *Worcester, earl of*
Abingdon (Berks.), abbey of, 42
Agenais, 152
Agincourt (Pas-de-Calais), 443 sq.; Roll
of, 50; Ballad of, 126
Aguenin, Jean, 230
Aigues Mortes (Gard), 83
Airaines (Somme), 354, 355
Aitre, Eustache de l', 200
Aixe-sur-Vienne (Haute-Vienne), 82
Albany, Robert Stewart, duke of, 87,
89
Albergati, Nicholas, bishop of Bologna,
377
Albi (Tarn), 82, 307
Albret, Charles II, lord of, 83, 151, 158,
238, 365, 372
Alcobaça, Pedro de, 223
Alençon (Orne), 26, 66, 68, 73, 81, 151,
156, 236, 240, 246, 260, 313
— John II, duke of, 67, 106, 316
— Bastard of, 107, 197
Alespe, Jean, 189
Alexander, Bastard of Bourbon, 49
Aleyn, John, 282
Alfonso V, king of Aragon, 173, 289
Alington, William, 151, 195, 238, 243,
246, 250, 254, 255, 257-260
Allemagne (Calvados), 58
Almaly (Herefordshire), 95
Alnmouth (Northumberland), 402
Alnwick, William, 288
Alost, county of, 29
Altrée, river, 300, 303
Amiens (Somme), 78, 79, 81, 122, 227,
232, 234, 266, 267, 296, 322, 326, 333,
343, 354, 357, 378, 385, 407, 410
— bishop of, see *Harcourt, Jean d'*
Amy (Oise), 196
Anet (Eure-et-Loir), 236
Angennes, Jean d', 110
Angers (Maine-et-Loire), 77, 300, 314
Angoumois, 152, 371
Anjou, 154, 165, 299, 314, 315, 378
— Louis II, duke of, 17, 25, 29, 67,
77
Anjou, Louis III, duke of, 69, 106,
289
— Yolande, duchess of, 69, 150, 152, 158,
173
Anne of Burgundy, 174
Aquitaine, 157, 166, 364, 366, 368, 372
Aragon, 174, 175, 361, 365
— Alfonso V, king of, 173, 288
— Ferdinand I, king of, 175
— Martin of, king of Sicily, 175
Ardevon (Manche), 218
Ardres (Pas-de-Calais), 53
Argentan (Orne), 65, 258
Arles (Bouches du Rhône), 34
Arly, Bastard of, 133, 137
Armagnac, Bernard VII, count of, 3, 17,
39, 76, 102, 104
— Bernard of, brother of John IV, 371
— John IV, count of, 83, 151, 158, 365,
371
Armagnacs, the, 3, 20, 34, 67, 78, 79,
83, 103, 116, 122, 135, 158, 162, 168,
169, 192, 196, 207, 386; see *Dau-
phinists*
Arques (Seine-Inf.), 176, 242
Arras (Pas-de-Calais), 79, 188, 190, 192,
310, 326, 343; bishop of, see *Porée, M.*
Artillery, 58, 59, 70, 71, 82, 103, 107,
108 sq., 113, 119, 122, 128, 132, 135,
186, 209, 212, 226, 313, 317, 334, 340,
347, 350, 368, 369 sq., 412
Artois, 153, 188, 234, 321, 326, 343, 409,
410, 422
Arundel, John Fitzalan, earl of, see *Ma-
travers*
— John, kt., 113, 182, 318
— Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury,
281
Arundel and Surrey, Thomas Fitzalan,
earl of, 12, 278
Ashton, John, kt., 64, 73, 218, 343
Ashton-under-Lyne (Lancs.), 64
Athol, Walter Stewart, earl of, 286
Auge, 54, 111, 262
Aumale, Jean d'Harcourt, count of, 122,
218, 295, 316, 342, 413
Auneau (Eure-et-Loir), 327, 378
Austria, Albert IV, duke of, 5
Auvillars (Calvados), 54
Auxerre (Yonne), 78, 192, 330
Avignon (Vaucluse), 2

- Avranches (Manche), 73, 180, 240, 246, 254, 263, 342, 343
- Babington, William, 219
- Bacqueville (Seine-Inf.), 431
- Guillaume, lord of, 121
- Ballon (Sarthe), 216
- Banyard, Richard, 397
- Bapaume (Pas-de-Calais), 198, 354
- Bar, Cardinal Louis, duke of, 3
- Guy de, 104
- Barbazan, Arnaud Guillaume, lord of, 211, 215, 230, 446
- Bardolph, William, kt., 41, 175, 285, 296
- Barmoor (Northumb.), 90
- Barnet (Herts.), 87
- Barneville-le-Bertrand (Calvados), 98
- Bastille of St Antoine, the, 105, 215, 323, 328, 381
- Bateman, John, 394
- Bath (Somerset), 42, 404
- Bath Easton (Somerset), 404
- Baugé (Maine-et-Loire), battle of, 271, 272, 285, 289, 293 sqq.; visited by the dauphin, 311
- Baume-Montrevel, Jean de la, 380, 381
- Baus, Guillaume de, 150
- Bayeux (Calvados), 64, 72, 158, 254, 258, 263; bishop of, see *Langret*, f.
- Bayonne (Basses-Pyrénées), 44, 182, 365, 371
- Bazas (Gironde), 369, 370, 371
- Béarn, 372
- Beaucaire (Gard), 5
- Beauce, 296, 329
- Beauchamp, Richard, see *Warwick*, earl of; *Worcester*, earl of
- Walter, kt., 141, 238, 319
- William, kt., 110, 175
- Beaufort (Aube), 155
- Beaufort, Edmund, 301, 306
- Henry, bishop of Winchester, 13, 22, 29, 36, 42, 98, 99, 159, 165, 171, 269, 274, 275, 278, 394, 417, 426
- Joan, 287
- John, see *Somerset*, earl of
- Thomas, see *Exeter*, duke of
- Beaufort-en-Vallée (Maine-et-Loire), 300, 301, 304 sqq.
- Beaugency (Loiret), 327 sqq.
- Beaulieu Heath (Hants.), 48
- Beaumont, Charles, 175
- Beaumont-le-Chétif (Eure-et-Loir), 316
- Beaumont-le-Roger (Eure), 180
- Beaumont-le-Vicomte (Sarthe), 67, 107, 216, 237
- Beaumont-sur-Oise (Seine-et-Oise), 6, 21, 79, 140, 168, 236
- Beauvoir (Nord), 197, 213
- Beauvais (Oise), 6, 16, 17, 24, 79, 135, 140, 234, 321, 322, 378, 384
- bishops of, see *Chevrenon*, B. de; *Cauchon*, P.
- Beauvaisis, 334, 357
- Bec-Hellouin, abbey of (Eure), 111, 264, 315
- Becket, Thomas, shrine of, 10
- Bedford, John of Lancaster, duke of, 10, 13, 19, 23, 37, 92, 174, 182, 219, 225, 247, 249, 267, 380, 393, 394, 398, 399, 406, 415, 420, 421, 422, 434; guardian of England, 48, 318; proposed adoption as heir to Naples, 172 sq.; at siege of Melun, 211; constable of England, 269; commands Cosne relief force, 410 sq.; at Henry V's death, 416 sq.
- Belle Isle (Brittany), 181
- Bellême (Orne), 67
- Benedict, St, Order of, 283 sqq.
- Benedict XIII (Peter de Luna), Pope, 1, 102
- Berkeley, James, Lord, 396
- Berkshire, 273, 279
- Bernay (Eure), 112, 299, 315, 413
- Berry, John, duke of, 3, 4, 7, 77
- Bertram, John, 88
- Berwick-on-Tweed, 89, 90
- Beverley (Yorks.), 271
- Biggleswade (Beds.), 405
- Bigorre, county of, 373
- Biherel, river, 169
- Bishop Auckland (Durham), 222
- Bishop's Waltham (Hants.), 47
- Black Death, 124
- Blackheath (Kent), 10, 268, 422
- Blanchard, Alain, 123, 143, 144
- Blanche of Navarre, 175
- Blanchetaque (Somme), 333, 334
- Blandy (Seine-et-Marne), castle of, 212
- Blois (Loir-et-Cher), 80, 328, 329
- Charles de, 290
- Olivier de, see *Penthievre*, count of
- Blount, John, kt., 133, 149
- Blyth (Notts.) priory of, 403
- Bohemia, 360, 376
- Bohun, family of, 280
- Bois de Vincennes (Seine), 344, 381, 389, 410, 411, 415, 416, 420
- Bois-Malesherbes (Loiret), 233
- Boisruffin (Eure-et-Loir), 316
- Bologna, bishop of, see *Albergati*, N.
- Bolton (Yorks.) priory of, 348
- Bonenfant, Jean, 54
- Bonneval (Eure-et-Loir), 316, 327
- Bonneville (Calvados), castle of, 54, 55
- Bonport (Eure), 114, 116

- Bonsmoulins (Orne), castle of, 246
 Bordeaux (Gironde), 83, 366, 367 sqq.,
 376
 — archbishop of, see *Montferrand, D. de*
 Bordelais, 367
 Bordenast, Yves de, 245
 Bosredon, Louis, 80
 Bouaffles (Eure), 253
 Bouchain (Nord), 78, 292
 Boucicaut, Jean le Meingre de, marshal
 of France, 39, 40
 Bouconvillers (Oise), 193
 Boulogne-sur-Mer (Pas-de-Calais), 7, 18,
 24, 25, 26, 53, 336, 421
 Bourbon, John, duke of, 39, 40, 41, 49,
 287
 Bourchier, Henry, see *Eu*
 — William, see *Eu*
 Bourg (Gironde), 367, 369, 371
 Bourg-la-Reine (Seine-et-Oise), 3
 Bourges (Cher), 183, 341
 Bournel, Louis, 295, 407
 Bouteiller, Charles le, 306
 — Guillaume le, 17, 230
 — Guy le, 122, 123, 137, 141, 144, 177,
 189, 241
 Bowet, Henry, archbishop of York, 89
 Brabant, duchy of, 27, 29, 403
 — John, duke of, 79, 174, 188, 290
 Bracciolini, Gian Francesco Poggio, 100
 Bradenstoke (Wilts.), priory of, 42
 Branch, Philip, kt., 413
 Brandenburg, see *Hohenzollern, Frederick*
of
 Braquemont, John, 395
 — Robert de, 116, 152, 181
 Bray (Seine-et-Marne), 83, 185, 208, 330
 Bray-sur-Somme (Somme), 408
 Breteuil (Oise), 181
 Brétigny, treaty of, 15, 40, 151, 153, 154,
 157, 161, 165, 281
 Bretons, 317, 328, 339, 342, 363, 364
 Bricquebec (Manche), 73
 Bridgwater (Somerset), 42, 396
 Bridlington (Yorks.), 271
 Brie, 78, 202, 208, 210, 211, 293, 330,
 334, 337
 Brie-comte-Robert (Seine-et-Marne), 416
 Brieg, Louis, duke of, 13, 20
 Brindisi, 173
 Brinkeley, John, 245
 Bristol, 42, 270, 272, 281, 342, 368
 Brittany, 42, 45, 67, 75, 81, 166, 216,
 289, 342, 363, 378
 — Arthur of, see *Richemont*
 — John V, duke of, 67, 75, 77, 81, 106,
 158, 161, 216, 217, 222, 244, 289, 363,
 364
 Brittany, Richard of, see *Étampes, count of*
 Broadwater (Sussex), 22
 Brocart, Pernel, 223
 Broniarth (Montgomerysh.), 93
 Brons, Thomas, 201, 247
 Brook, Thomas, 88
 Brou (Eure-et-Loir), 325
 Brown, William, 88, 221
 Bruges (Flanders), 6, 30, 310, 336
 Brussels, 6, 291
 Bruton (Somerset), 42
 Buch, capital de, see *Longueville, count of*
 Buchan, John Stewart, earl of, 183, 218,
 294, 300, 302 sq., 313, 316, 328; con-
 stable of France, 311
 Buckinghamshire, 279
 Buda-Pest, 8
 Budos (Gironde), 369, 370
 — André de, 369
 Burgeys, Louis, 244, 250
 Burgh, John, 238
 Burgundians, the, 20 sq., 26, 79, 158, 169,
 203
 Burgundy, John the Fearless, duke of,
 1, 2, 3, 19, 20, 21, 26, 30, 55, 67, 77, 82,
 102, 105, 106, 117, 121, 134, 140, 141,
 151, 152, 160, 161, 177, 178, 181, 182,
 184, 209, 290, 410; meets Henry V
 at Calais, 26 sqq.; marches on Paris,
 78 sq.; allies with Queen Isabel, 80;
 Paris seized by supporters, 102 sqq.;
 negotiates with Henry, 156 sqq.; at-
 tends conference at Meulan, 164 sqq.;
 makes peace with dauphin, 169; mur-
 dered, 186
 — Margaret, duchess of, wife of John the
 Fearless, 187, 188, 198
 — Philip the Bold, duke of, 14
 — Philip the Good, duke of, 187, 188,
 195, 197, 199, 201, 207, 208, 210, 212,
 213, 215, 229, 232, 233, 234, 259, 278,
 289, 290 sqq., 310, 320, 321 sqq., 326,
 343 sqq., 362, 374, 377, 378, 381, 408,
 417, 421, 426; as count of Charolais,
 20, 26, 122; negotiates alliance with
 Henry V, 189 sqq.; signs treaty of
 Troyes, 202 sqq.; in Paris with Henry,
 224 sqq.; at trial of father's murderers,
 230 sqq.; at battle of Mons-en-Vimeu,
 333 sqq.; visits Paris and Meaux,
 343 sqq.; relieves Cosne, 409 sqq.; be-
 haviour at Henry's death, 416, 420
 Burnell, Hugh, Lord, 275
 Bury St Edmunds (Suffolk), 432
 Butler, James, see *Ormonde*
 — Ralph, kt., 259, 260, 354, 355, 413
 — Thomas, earl, see *Ormonde*
 — Thomas, prior of Kilmainham, 131

- Caen (Calvados), 65, 70, 101, 108, 158, 247, 258, 351; siege of, 56 sqq., 79, 446, 447; Henry V at, 62 sqq., 72, 73 sqq., 436; English settlers in, 62, 251; *bailliage* of, 73, 240, 241, 260; Norman *chambre des comptes* at, 74, 194, 244, 248; Norman treasury at, 194, 243 sq.; visited by Vincent Ferrer, 75 sqq., 419, 446; garrison of, 240, 261; stone of, 423
- Calais (Pas-de-Calais), 7, 9, 30, 39, 162, 219, 220, 277, 279, 334, 370, 422; conference at, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22 sqq., 75; further negotiations at, 41; visited by Henry and Catherine, 267; cost of defence of, 274; Jacqueline of Hainault at, 291; Henry at, 318 sq.; mint at, 279, 397, 402
- Calez, Jacques de, 249
- Cambridge, Statute of, 37
- University of, 283, 432, 436
- Camoys, Thomas, Lord, 10, 27
- Campo Fregoso, Tomaso, doge of Genoa, 358
- Canterbury (Kent), 10, 18, 21, 42, 267, 318, 405, 422
- archbishops of, see *Arundel, T., Chichele, H.*
- St Augustine's Abbey, see *Dandelyon, M.*
- treaty of, 19, 24, 30, 32, 34, 36, 359, 360
- Capranica, Paul de, bishop of Évreux, 263
- Carcassonne (Aude), 82, 83
- Carentan (Manche), 73, 258
- Carew, Peter, 30
- Thomas, kt., 45, 63, 183, 361
- Carnarvon, 351
- Castile, 45, 181, 182, 226, 285, 289, 360, 361, 365, 369
- John II, king of, 17, 81, 181
- Castillon, Pons, lord of, 45
- Castillonès (Lot-et-Garonne), 367
- Caterick, John, bishop successively of Lichfield and Exeter, 26, 99, 171
- Catherine of France, daughter of Charles VI, 161, 180, 187, 189, 191, 200, 203, 232, 265; picture of, 157; dowry of, 157, 162, 166, 198, 268; meeting with Henry, 165; betrothed and married to Henry V, 205 sq.; accompanies Henry to Sens, 207 sq.; at siege of Melun, 212; state entry into Paris, 225; at Rouen, 234; her journey to England, 267; in London, 268; crowned, 268 sqq.; travels in England, 270 sq.; contributes to loan, 275, 400; gives birth to a son, 393; in France, 402, 406, 407; absent at Henry's death, 416; accompanies Henry's body to England, 421 sq.; has effigy placed on Henry's tomb, 423
- Cauchon, Pierre, bishop of Beauvais, 234, 344, 412, 421
- Caudebec (Seine-Inf.), 128 sq., 130
- Caux, 194, 238, 240, 260, 267, 343, 440
- Caxton, William, 23
- Chailloué (Orne), 65
- Chalon, Louis de, prince of Orange, see *Orange*
- Louis de, count of Tonnerre, 152
- Châlons-sur-Marne (Marne), 78, 198
- Chambéry (Savoie), 3
- Chambois (Orne), 65
- Chambrois (Eure), 111
- Champagne, 20, 78, 211, 293, 334, 378, 409
- Champtoceaux (Maine-et-Loire), 217
- Charente, river, 82
- Charenton (Seine), 199, 201, 415
- Charles IV, emperor, 5
- V, king of France, 5
- VI, king of France, 4, 19, 24, 29, 106, 130, 134, 140, 157, 158, 161, 167, 184, 189, 190, 191, 195, 201, 212, 227, 228, 229, 231, 233, 234, 254, 271, 272, 284, 326, 327, 350, 362, 372, 377, 407, 414, 426; favours peace, 16, 17; illness of, 77, 103, 162, 164, 189, 202; imprisons Queen Isabel, 80; in hands of Burgundians, 103; accepts treaty of Troyes, 198 sqq., 202 sqq., 227; accompanies Henry on campaign, 207 sq.; at siege of Melun, 213; enters Paris with Henry, 223 sq.; at trial of Montereau murderers, 230 sq.; Henry's treatment of, 232, 387 sqq., 392, 406; at siege of Méaux, 344, 387; household of, 387 sqq., 392
- the Bad, king of Navarre, 108
- the dauphin, afterwards Charles VII, 102, 106, 121, 134, 140, 192, 214, 217, 294, 309 sq., 327, 365, 370, 371, 376, 390; negotiates with Henry, 150 sqq., 159, 189; breaks faith with Henry, 160; makes peace with Burgundy, 168 sqq.; recruits Scots, 181 sqq.; at Montereau, 185 sqq.; charged with murder of duke of Burgundy, 197, 230; sentenced, 234; signs treaty with Brittany, 290; assumes offensive, 311, 316; besieges Chartres, 316 sq.; retreats to Touraine, 325; refuses battle, 327 sqq., 331; fails to relieve Méaux, 341; besieges Cosne, 409 sq.
- III, king of Navarre, 175

- Charmes (Aisne), 162
 Charolais, 409
 — Philip, count of, see *Burgundy, Philip the Good, duke of*
 Chars (Seine-et-Oise), 193
 Chartley, see *Ferrers*
 Chartrain, the, 177, 378, 413
 Chartres (Eure-et-Loir), 80, 81, 232, 296, 316; siege of, 317; Henry at, 327; *bailliage* of, 378
 — Renaud de, archbishop of Rheims, 6, 16, 17, 24, 41, 97, 101
 Chastel, Tanneguy du, 103, 106, 162, 186, 230, 328, 329, 409
 Chastellux, Claude de Beauvoir, lord of, 116, 380, 381
 Châteaudun (Eure-et-Loir), 325, 328, 378
 Château Gaillard (Eure), 176, 177, 194, 215, 223, 242
 Château Gontier (Mayenne), 314
 Châteaurenard (Loiret), 211, 329
 Château Thierry (Aisne), 296
 Châteauvillain, Guillaume, lord of, 324
 Châtillon (Seine-et-Oise), 79
 — Guillaume, lord of, 310
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 429
 — Thomas, 276, 429
 Chauffeur, Henri de, 189
 Chaumont (Oise), 236, 243
 — Bertrand de, 214
 Chaumont-Quitry, lord of, 294
 Chef de Caux, 440
 Cherbourg (Manche), 107 sqq., 131, 240, 260
 Cheshire, 318
 Chesterton (Warwicksh.), 85, 404
 Chevenon, Bernard de, bishop of Beauvais, 156
 Chichele, Henry, archbishop of Canterbury, 10, 22, 47, 87, 91, 93, 137, 141, 171, 219, 221, 268, 269, 281, 282, 394, 403, 404, 422; diplomatic services of, 24, 25, 139, 156, 159, 165, 168; protests against Beaufort's cardinalate, 99
 Chichester (Sussex), 242; bishops of, see *Kemp, J.; Polton, T.*
 Chillworth (Hants.), 48
 Chinon (Indre-et-Loire), 311
 Chirk (Denbighsh.), 351
 Chissay, Guichard de, 338, 350, 351
 Cilly, Hermann, count of, 8
 Cinque Ports, the, 21, 267, 269, 320, 402
 Clairac (Lot-et-Garonne), 367
 Clamecy (Nièvre), 330
 — Gilles, lord of, 286
 Clarence, Thomas, duke of, 10, 19, 25, 37, 47, 51, 52, 61, 74, 115, 125, 126, 175, 215, 272, 276, 294, 310, 312; appointed keeper of England, 22; constable of the English army, 53; grants to, 54, 111, 248; at siege of Caen, 57 sqq.; at siege of Falaise, 70; commands force in Lower Normandy, 111 sqq.; at siege of Rouen, 126, 137 sq.; dauphin treats with, 150; captures Mantes, 164; at conference of Meulan, 165; before Paris, 184; captain of Paris, 213; enters Paris with Henry, 225; his status in Henry's absence, 234, 239; raids Beauce, 296; in command at Baugé, 299 sqq.; his son, 300, 308
 Clémanges, Nicolas de, 101
 Clerc, Guillaume le, 200, 379, 380
 — Jean le, chancellor of France, 199, 227, 230, 344, 380
 Clerc, Simon, 92
 Clermont-en-Auvergne (Clermont-Ferrand, Puy de Dôme), 29, 294, 311
 Clermont-en-Beauvaisis (Oise), 197
 Clifford, John, Lord, 44, 51, 110, 269, 348
 — Robert, bishop of London, 405
 Clinton and Say, William, Lord, 398, 399
 Clux, Hartung van, 2, 31, 32, 360
 Cockersand (Lancs.), priory of, 403
 Coggeshale, William, 360
 Cokirnage, William, 282
 Col, Gontier, 17, 24, 41, 97
 Colchester (Essex), 396
 Colles, Roger, 223
 Cologne, 31; archbishops of, see *Mörs, Dietrich von; Frederick of Saarwerden*
 Colvile, John, 174, 286
 Comminges, Mathieu de Foix, count of, 365, 372
 Compiègne (Oise), 78, 135, 196, 261, 293, 294, 296, 334, 336, 354, 356, 407, 408, 415
 Constance, 1, 14, 18, 31, 33, 34, 99, 100, 101, 172, 175, 233, 361, 436
 Constantinople, 387
 Conversen and Brienne, Peter of Luxemburg, count of, 213, 345, 349, 353
 Convocation of Canterbury, 38, 91 sq., 220 sqq., 281 sqq., 403 sq.
 — of York, 38, 91 sq., 220, 403
 Conway (Carnarvonsh.), 351
 Coq, Hugues le, 232
 Corbeil (Seine-et-Oise), 79, 169, 212, 224, 410, 415
 Corbridge, John, 434
 Cornwall, John, kt., 10, 54, 58, 115, 131, 196, 208, 318, 339

- Cosne (Nièvre), 341, 409, 410, 411, 415
 Cotentin, the, 63, 72, 73, 180, 240, 241, 260, 343
 Couason, river, 300, 302, 303
 Coucy, Raoul de, bishop of Noyon, 357
 Council, Royal (English), 9, 10, 44, 89, 90, 223, 275, 277, 280, 292, 359, 377, 393, 394, 395, 398, 402, 430
 Courcelles, Jean de, 214
 Courcy (Calvados), 65
 Courtecuisse, Jean, bishop of Paris, 233, 386 sq.
 Courtenay, Hugh, 182
 Courtivron, lord of, 191
 Courtonne (Calvados), 111
 Coutances (Manche), 73; bishop of, see *Malatesta, P.*
 Couteiller, Benedict, 245
 Coventry (Warwicksh.), 42, 270; prior of, 275
 Coventry, John, 88
 Cowdray, Richard, 156, 159, 189, 201, 204
 Crécy-sur-Marne (Seine-et-Marne), 337
 — (Somme), forest of, 321
 Creil (Oise), 293
 Crépy (Oise), 357
 Crépy-en-Laonnais (Aisne), 198
 Cressonsacq (Oise), 356
 Creully (Calvados), 64
 Croisset (Seine-Inf.), 129
 Croissy (Oise), 326
 Croisy (Eure), 216
 Croix, Jean de la, 303
 Cromwell, Ralph, kt., 204, 315
 Croy, Antoine, lord of, 410
 Cumberland, county of, 37, 279, 403

 Dabridgecourt, John, kt., 12
 Dalton, John, 244
 Dammartin (Seine-et-Marne), 20
 — Antoine de Vergy, count of, 380
 Dandelyon, Marcellus, abbot of St Augustine's, Canterbury, 275
 Dangeul (Sarthe), 67
 Dartford (Kent), 10, 422
 Dauphiné, 34, 84, 359
 Dauphinists, 207, 234, 261, 285, 286, 293, 294, 296, 299 sqq., 315, 383, 409; see *Armagnacs*
 Dax (Landes), 366, 371
 Derby (Derbysh.), 42
 Dereham, Richard, 39, 436
 Devizes (Wilts.), 42
 Devon, Edward Courtenay, 12th earl of, 91
 — Hugh Courtenay, 13th earl of, 275, 396
 Dieppe (Seine-Inf.), 41, 53, 122, 176, 180, 240, 248, 258
 Dijon (Côte d'Or), 83, 105, 187, 209, 230, 293, 294, 345, 362, 409
 Dinant (Namur), 52
 Dives (Calvados), 58
 Divette, river, 108
 Dol (Ille-et-Vilaine), 158
 Domfront (Orne), 107, 129, 413
 Domvast (Somme), 321
 Dorchester (Oxon.), abbey of, 42
 Dordrecht (Holland), 18, 30, 33, 46
 Doriac, Renaud, 389
 Dorset, earl of, see *Exeter, duke of*
 Douglas, Archibald, 4th earl of, 89, 90, 287, 307, 358
 — William, kt., 87, 181
 Doule, Jean, 191, 380, 386
 Doullens (Somme), 234, 267
 Douvriert (Somme), 336
 Dover (Kent), 9, 21, 267, 287, 292, 318, 319, 370, 393, 422, 446
 Dragon, Order of the, 13
 Drax (Yorks.), 220
 Dreux (Eure-et-Loir), 159, 160, 216, 236, 261, 315, 326, 331, 358, 381
 Dublin, 308
 Dunster (Somerset), 430
 Dunwich (Suffolk), 36
 Durham, archdeacon of, see *Kemp, J.*;
 bishop of, see *Langley, T.*

 Earl Marshal, see *Nottingham, earl of*
 Échiquier, the Norman, 111, 194, 247 sqq.
 Eggleston (Yorks.), abbey of, 220
 Elizabeth, daughter of Sigismund, 5
 Ellerton (Yorks.), priory of, 220
 Eltham (Kent), 18, 39, 268
 Elton, John, 89
 Ely, bishop of, see *Fordham, J.*
 Epéard (Eure), 253
 Épernon (Eure-et-Loir), 327
 Erpingham, Thomas, kt., 27, 94, 95
 Essai (Orne), 65; castle of, 246
 Essex, 397
 Estissac, Maurigon d', 326
 Estouteville, Jean, lord of, 39
 Étampes (Seine-et-Oise), 3
 — Richard of Brittany, count of, 217, 290, 316, 331, 342, 363
 Étaples (Pas-de-Calais), 6, 296
 Éterville (Calvados), 58
 Étrepagny (Eure), 176
 Etrickdale, 90
 Eu (Seine-Inf.), 26, 176, 240, 296, 354, 413
 — Charles d'Artois, count of, 39, 417

- Eu, Henry Bourchier, count of, 240
 — William Bourchier, count of, 10, 176, 252
 Eure, river, 114, 236
 Evesham, Richard Bromsgrove, abbot of, 283
 Évreux (Eure), 73, 112, 130, 159, 160, 240, 254, 260, 263, 327, 328, 413
 Ewelme (Oxon.), 430
 Exchequer, the English, 43, 390, 391, 399, 433
 Exeter, bishop of, see *Lacy, E.*
 — Thomas Beaufort, duke of, previously earl of Dorset, 24, 175, 239, 261, 331, 380, 406, 432; receives title of duke, 37; admiral, 53, 113, 182; leads force against Scots, 89 sq.; captures Évreux, 112; at siege of Rouen, 117, 123 sqq., 138; captain of Rouen, 141; at conference of Meulan, 164 sq.; assists in reduction of Upper Normandy, 175, 176; enters Paris with Henry, 225; military governor of Paris, 234, 323, 380, 381; arrests lord of L'Isle Adam, 323; at siege of Meaux, 337 sqq.; at Cosne, 410 sq.; at Henry's deathbed, 416 sq.
 Exmes (Orne), 65, 246
 Fabas, Menaut de, 369, 370
 Falaise (Calvados), 62, 66, 69 sqq., 97, 258, 261, 413
 Falstaff, Sir John, 428
 Faugnernon (Calvados), 111
 Fécamp (Seine-Inf.), 176
 Felbrigge, Simon, kt., 95
 Felley (Notts.), priory of, 220
 Ferrer, Vincent, 75 sqq., 419, 446, 447, 448
 Ferrers of Chartley, Edmund, Lord, 51, 131
 Fiennes, Roger, kt., 176, 238
 Fife, Murdach Stewart, earl of, 88
 Fillastre, Guillaume, cardinal, 100, 101
 Fitton, John, 173
 Fitzhugh, Henry, Lord, 22, 38, 85, 113, 128, 139, 191, 435
 — Robert, 437
 Fitzwalter, Walter, Lord, 301, 306
 Flanders, 151, 153, 154, 166, 188, 266, 278, 343, 418
 Flavy, Jean de, 346
 Fleming, Richard, bishop of Lincoln, 272
 Flint, 351
 Flisc, Marselin de, 395
 Flower, Roger, 37, 91, 219
 Foix, Archambaud de Grailly, count of, 178
 Foix, Archambaud de (son of the preceding), see *Navailles, lord of*
 — Gaston de, see *Longueville, count of*
 — Jean de Grailly, count of, 178, 238, 364, 372 sq., 402
 — Mathieu de, see *Comminges, count of*
 Fontaines, Guérin, lord of, 300, 303, 305, 306
 Fontenay-le-Tesson (Calvados), 58
 Forbes, Alexander, 287
 Fordham, John, bishop of Ely, 42
 Forester, John, archdeacon of Surrey, 32
 Formelles, Simon de, 189
 Fortescue, Henry, 182
 Foul Raid, the, 90
 Frederick of Saarwerden, archbishop of Cologne, 32
 Fresnay-le-Vicomte (Sarthe), 107, 216
 Fresnel, Pierre, bishop of Lisieux, 121
 Fronsac (Gironde), castle of, 400
 Fuenterrabia, 365
 Fulk, the Black, count of Anjou, 300
 Gabelle, the, 72, 75, 228, 251
 Gaeta, 173
 Gaillefontaine (Seine-Inf.), 258
 Gallardon (Eure-et-Loir), 316, 327
 Gamaches (Somme), 295, 354, 407
 — Gilles de, 334, 335
 — Guillaume, lord of, 181, 294, 354, 356, 408
 — Louis de, 334, 335
 — Philippe de, abbot of St Faro, Meaux, 350, 356
 Gand, Jean de, 419
 Gara, Nicholas of, see *Hungary*
 Gargante, Thomas, 242
 Garter, Order of the, 12 sqq., 30, 31, 35, 149
 Gascoigne, Thomas, 435
 — William, kt., 201
 Gascony, 22, 178, 368, 378, 372, 373; crossbowmen from, 44
 Gast, Louis, 338, 350, 351
 Gâtinais, 210, 329
 Gaucourt, Raoul, lord of, 16, 18, 39, 40, 41
 — Raoul de, *bailli* of Rouen, 121
 Gaunstede, Simon, 22
 Gelu, Jacques, archbishop of Tours, 150
 Geneva, 2, 374, 387
 Genoa, 45, 288, 292, 358, 359
 Genoese, the, 33, 46, 48, 59, 175, 287, 288, 289
 Germany, Henry's relations with, 32, 33, 212, 359, 361 sq.; see also *Sigismund*
 Ghent (Flanders), 230, 234
 Giac, Jeanne de, 169
 Gien (Loiret), 341

- Gisors (Eure), 162, 176, 177, 188, 193,
194, 236, 238, 240, 242, 243, 258, 260,
321, 322, 328, 408
- Glamorgan, 395
- Glastonbury (Somerset), 42
- Glendower, Meredith, 85
— Owen, 85
- Gloucester, Humphrey, duke of, 73, 125,
165, 204, 265, 291, 292, 325, 420, 433,
446; receives Sigismund, 9; hostage in
Flanders, 26 sq.; escorts Sigismund, 30;
at siege of Caen, 58; captures Bayeux,
64; at siege of Falaise, 70; besieges
Cherbourg, 107 sqq.; at siege of Rouen,
131, 139; projected marriage of, 175;
captures Ivry, 177; captures Poissy,
194; regent, 219, 401; at Queen Cath-
erine's coronation, 269; receives Jacque-
line of Hainault, 291; besieges Dreux,
326 sq.; named protector of England,
417
- Godeston, Thomas, 396
- Goes (Zealand), 46, 402
- Golafre, John, 250
- Goldbeter, Bartholomew, 402
- Gordon, Alexander Seton, lord of, 287
- Gournay (Seine-Inf.), 176, 237
- Gournay-sur-Aronde (Oise), 356
- Gran (Hungary), archbishop of, see
Kanitz
- Grandvilliers (Oise), 197
- Gravelines (Nord), 26, 27, 151
- Gregory, William, 125
- Greindor, Henry, 86
- Grentheville (Calvados), 58
- Grey of Codnor, John, Lord, 319
— of Codnor, Richard, Lord, 51, 58, 149
— of Heton, see *Tancarville*
— of Ruthin, Reginald, Lord, 10
- Griffith, Edward ap, 71
- Guernier, John, 241
— Michel, 238
- Guernsey, 109, 223
- Guibray (Calvados), 70
- Guienne, 175, 366, 367, 371, 373, 400
- Guilbaut, Guy, 385
- Guise (Aisne), 293, 357
- Guitry, Guillaume de Chaumont, lord of,
209
- Haarlem (North Holland), 46
- Habart, Nicolas, bishop of Bayeux, 263
- Hainault, county of, 14, 77, 81
— Jacqueline of, see *Holland*
- Hales (Gloucester), abbey of, 42
- Halsall, Gilbert, kt., 181, 236, 327
- Hambye (Manche), 73
- Hanborough (Oxon.), 429
- Hankford, William, chief justice of the
King's Bench, 93
- Hansa, the German, 30, 34
- Harcourt (Eure), 111, 112, 315; county of,
261
— Jacques d', see *Tancarville*
— Jean d', bishop of Amiens, 412
— Jean d', count of Aumale, see *Aumale*
— Louis d', archbishop of Rouen, 123
- Hardicourt (Seine-et-Oise), 163
- "Harelle" rising, the, 121, 124
- Harfleur (Seine-Inf.), 1, 2, 5, 12, 15, 17,
24, 25, 40, 44, 86, 128, 133, 251, 261,
309, 402, 441
- Harington, John, 22
— William, kt., 12
- Harlech (Merioneth), 351
- Harmondsworth (Middlesex), 222
- Harringworth, William, Lord Zouch of, 12
- Haseley, Thomas, 395
- Hatfield (Herts.), 394
- Hawick (Roxburghsh.), 90
- Hawley, John, 182
- Hebron, bishop of, 172
- Henley (Oxon.), 42
- Henry V, king of England, entertains
Sigismund, 10 sqq.; signs treaty of
Canterbury with Sigismund, 19; sails
to France, 22; at Calais, 22 sqq., 267,
318 sq.; relations with John, duke of
Burgundy, 27 sq., 156 sqq.; returns
to England, 29; prepares to invade
France, 36 sqq., 42 sqq.; relations with
duke of Bourbon, 39, 286 sq.; relations
with Brittany, 45, 67, 289, 342, 363,
378; makes second will, 47; returns to
France, 53; besieges Caen, 58 sqq.;
besieges Alençon, 66 sqq.; besieges Fal-
laise, 69 sqq.; at Caen, 72 sqq.; admini-
stration of Normandy, 73 sqq., 146 sq.,
194 sq., ch. lxxvii; receives Vincent Ferrer,
75 sqq.; attitude towards papacy, 99,
101, 171 sqq., 375 sqq., 405; besieges
Louviers, 113; besieges Pont de l'Arche,
114 sqq.; besieges Rouen, 118 sqq.;
builds palace in Rouen, 148; treats
with dauphin, 151 sqq., 159 sqq.; at
conference of Meulan, 164 sqq.; negoti-
ates for marriage with Catherine, 151,
155, 157, 161, 165, 168, 189, 205;
negotiates with Lorraine, Genoa, Nav-
arre, 174 sq.; discussions with Duke
Philip of Burgundy, 188 sqq., 321, 344;
negotiates treaty of Troyes, 198 sqq.;
besieges Sens, 208; besieges Montreau,
208 sqq.; besieges Melun, 210 sqq.; visits
Paris, 224 sqq., 322, 406; policy as
regent, 226 sqq., 322 sqq., chap. lxxiii;

- Henry V, king of England (*contd.*)
 visits Normandy, 234 sqq.; tours
 England, 270 sqq.; raises loan, 272 sqq.;
 meets parliament, 275; attempts monas-
 tic reform, 283 sqq.; returns to France,
 318; besieges Dreux, 326 sqq.; campaign
 in valley of Loire, 326 sqq.; captures
 Villeneuve-sur-Yonne, 330 sq.; his
 strategy in 1421, 330 sqq.; besieges
 Meaux, 337 sqq.; consequent successes
 in Northern France, 356 sqq.; policy in
 Gascony, 363 sq., 368 sqq.; visits
 Senlis and Compiègne, 408; illness of,
 410, 414; final instructions, 416 sq.;
 dies, 418; body taken to England, 420
 sqq.; estimates of, 423 sqq.
- Hereford, bishops of, see *Polton, T.*;
Spofford, T.
- Hertford, 270
- Herzelles, Jean de Roubaix, lord of, 214
- Hesdin (Pas-de-Calais), 26, 421
- Hexhamshire, 280
- Hohenzollern, Frederick of, margrave of
 Brandenburg, 15
- Holborn (London), 15
- Holland, Edward, see *Mortain, count of*
 — John, see *Huntingdon, earl of*
 — Zealand and Hainault, Jacqueline of
 Bavaria, countess of, 14, 16, 77, 78, 79,
 174, 274, 290 sqq., 320, 394
 — — — Margaret, countess of, 14, 77, 188
 — — — William VI, count of, 14, 16,
 19, 30, 33, 41, 77, 78, 149
- Holme, Richard, 436
- Honfleur (Calvados), 176, 251, 441
- Hornby, Robert, 54
- Houdetot, Guillaume, 123, 143, 144
- Hovingham, John, 26
- Huisne, river, 300
- Hungary, Nicholas of Gara, count pala-
 tine of, 13, 16
- Hungerford, Walter, kt., 9, 23, 110, 139,
 151, 156, 159, 191, 214, 348, 349, 417
- Hunslap, Harry, 35
- Hunt, Roger, 265
- Huntingdon, John Holland, earl of, 10,
 12, 38, 48, 53, 54, 58, 63, 73, 127, 178,
 181, 196, 210, 216, 225, 301, 306
- Hussites, the, 84, 360
- Île de France, 337, 378
- Illiers (Eure-et-Loire), 325
- Ingles, Harry, 60
- Ireland, 131, 274
- Isabel of Bavaria, queen of France, 78,
 80 sqq., 105, 134, 140, 157, 161, 162,
 164, 167, 168, 184, 187, 189, 192, 198,
 203, 204, 225, 232, 344, 390, 406, 408
- Isabel of Brittany, 69
- Isle Adam, Jean de Villiers, lord of l',
 79, 103, 178, 179, 207, 208, 294, 323, 380
- Isle of Wight, 285
- Isleworth (Middlesex), 446
- Ivry (Eure), 176, 177, 238, 255, 413
- Jacqueline of Hainault, see *Holland*
- James I, king of Scots, 212, 216, 267,
 269, 271, 286, 287, 327, 358, 395, 428
- Janville (Eure-et-Loir), 177
- Janyn, John, 130
- Jaquemyn, John, 242
- Jedburgh (Roxburghsh.), 90
- Jersey, island of, 109
- Jeune, Robert le, 267, 385
- Joan II, queen of Naples, 172 sq.
 — queen, widow of Henry IV of Eng-
 land, 22, 67, 68, 222 sq., 292, 394, 400
- John I, king of Portugal, 81, 128
- XXIII, pope, 100
- of Aragon, 175
- Bastard of Clarence, 300, 308
- of Nassau, archbishop of Mainz, 175
- the Fearless, see *Burgundy*
- Joigny (Yonne), 294, 295, 330
- Jourdain, Jean, 123, 143
- Juch, Henri du, 158, 217
- Kanitz, John, archbishop of Gran, 8, 16
- Keighley, John, kt., 55, 238
- Kemp, John, successively archdeacon of
 Durham and bishop of Rochester,
 Chichester, and London, chancellor of
 Normandy, 159, 161, 172, 189, 191,
 200, 242, 380, 405
- Kenilworth (Warwicksh.), 41, 86, 270, 351
- Kennedy, Alexander, 287
 — Fergus, 287
 — Walter, 302
- Kent, Lucy, countess of, 278
- Kerabret, Alan, bishop of St Pol de
 Léon, 169
- Kilmainham, Thomas Butler, prior of, 148
- King's Hall, Cambridge, 436
- Kirkham (Yorks.), priory of, 220
- Knoldenhall (Hants.), 48
- Kuttenberg, battle of, 360
- Kynwolmersh, William, 85
- Labourde, county of, 182
- Labourde, Edmund, 427
- Labourers, statutes of, 277
- La Bruère (Loiret), 328
- La Carneille (Orne), 261
- La Charité-sur-Loire (Nièvre), 341, 409,
 411, 412
- Lacy, Edmund, bishop of Exeter, 284

- La Fayette, Gilbert, lord of, 300, 302, 313
 La Fère (Aisne), 197
 La Ferté (Somme), castle of, 321, 333
 La Ferté Bernard (Sarthe), 316
 — Villeneuve (Eure-et-Loir), 328
 La Flèche (Sarthe), 308
 La Fontaine-la-Vaganne (Oise), 197
 Lagny-sur-Marne (Seine-et-Marne), 184,
 199, 330, 337, 339
 La Haye du Puits (Manche), 73
 La Heaumerie, 408
 La Hire (Étienne de Vignolles), 293, 334,
 409
 Laigle (Orne), 65
 La Lande Chasles (Maine-et-Loire), 300,
 302
 La Marche, Jacques, count of, 172
 La Marque (Gironde), 370
 Lambeth (Surrey), 12, 30, 273
 Lamothe-Montravel (Dordogne), 366
 Lamotte-de-Cesny (Calvados), 64
 Lancashire, 318
 Lancaster, duchy of, 280
 Landes, the, 367, 371
 Langdon, John, bishop of Rochester,
 282, 405
 Langley, Thomas, bishop of Durham,
 13, 22, 156; chancellor of England,
 89, 99, 436; addresses Parliament, 219,
 276, 397
 Langres (Haute-Marne), 192
 Langret, Jean, bishop of Bayeux, 101
 Languedoc, 82, 359, 364, 372, 373
 Languedoil, States General of, 311
 Lannoy, Gilbert de, 189
 — Hue de, 199, 226, 355, 381, 410, 412,
 416
 Lante, Agostino de, 172 sq.
 Laon (Aisne), 198, 356
 Larcher, John, 231
 La Réole (Gironde), 82, 366
 La Rivière de Thibouville (Eure), 111, 180
 La Roche Guyon (Seine-et-Oise), 176
 La Rochelle (Charente-Inf.), 183, 197
 La Tombe (Seine-et-Marne), 83, 101, 116
 La Trappe, Soligny (Orne), abbey of, 66
 Lauderdale, 90
 Laurence, John, of Feltham, 282
 Laviers-le-Grand (Somme), 244
 Lavilletterre (Oise), 193
 Leaveland (Kent), 222
 Le Cateau-Cambrésis (Nord), 408
 Leche, Philip, kt., 125, 128, 210
 Le Crotoy (Somme), 53, 129, 295, 296,
 334, 336, 353, 354, 357, 412
 Leeds castle (Kent), 16, 18
 Legh, Peter de, kt., 242
 Le Hommet (Manche), 73
 Leicester, 90, 270, 282
 Le Lude (Sarthe), 300, 301, 308
 Le Mans (Sarthe), 216, 309, 311, 312, 313
 Le Neubourg (Eure), 113, 251
 Lenthall, Roland, kt., 73, 151
 Le Sage, Raoul, 217, 244, 247, 406
 Lescurie (Seine-Inf.), 130
 Les Damps (Eure), 116
 L'Estandart de Mailly (Jean, baron de
 Mailly), 315
 Les Veys (Manche), 72
 Lewis, Count Palatine of the Rhine, 183,
 205, 212
 Leyot, Richard, dean of St Asaph, 174
 Liège, 31, 53
 — dean of, 361
 — John of Bavaria, bishop of, 16, 174, 188
 Lilbourne, Thomas, kt., 223, 367, 371,
 394, 400
 Lille (Nord), 20, 26, 29, 234
 Lillebonne (Seine-Inf.), 176
 Limousin, the, 152, 217, 371
 Lincoln, 271
 — bishops of, see *Fleming, R.*; *Repingdon,*
P.
 Lingèvres (Calvados), 64
 Lisieux (Calvados), 55 sq., 112, 258, 262;
 bishop of, see *Fresnel, P.*
 Livet, Robert de, 123, 143, 144
 Llandaff (Glamorgan), 221
 Loir, river, 81, 300, 308
 Loire, river, 159, 162, 199, 293, 325, 327,
 378, 409, 412
 Lollards, the, 85 sqq., 221 sq., 281 sq.,
 395, 404, 429, 437
 Lomagne, John, viscount of, 82
 Lombards, the, 358
 London, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19, 41, 42, 242,
 267, 268, 292, 360, 393, 403, 404, 422,
 437; bishops of, see *Clifford, R.*; *Kemp,*
J.
 Longjumeau (Seine-et-Oise), 3
 Longueville, Gaston de Foix, captal de
 Buch, count of, 178, 365, 366, 370,
 371, 372
 Loré, Ambroise de, 181, 216
 Lorraine, Charles, duke of, 81, 174, 361,
 409
 Louis, dauphin, 77
 Louvain (Brabant), 6
 Louvet, Jean, president of Provence, 230,
 290
 Louviers (Eure), 101, 113, 114, 130, 159,
 258
 Louvre, the, 4, 104, 225, 406
 Lovel, John, Lord, 38
 Lowestoft (Suffolk), 402
 Luché (Sarthe), 300

- Luppé, Pierron de, 226, 293, 334, 335, 338, 345, 350, 351, 356
 Lusignan, Henri de, prince of Galilee, 172
 Lutterell, Hugh, kt., 176, 239, 243
 Luxemburg, city of, 31, 33; duchy of, 359
 — John of, 196, 214, 321, 336, 345, 354, 408, 410, 411
 — Louis of, bishop of Théroouanne, 344, 362, 380, 406
 — Peter of, see *Conversen*
 Lyndwood, William, 361
 Lynn (Norfolk), 272
 Lyons (Rhône), 2, 3, 287, 290, 311, 325, 358, 374
- Mâcon (Saône-et-Loire), 192
 Maine, 69, 81, 154, 165, 181, 216, 236, 243, 300, 309, 314, 315, 378, 413
 Maintenay (Pas-de-Calais), 321
 Mainz, archbishop of, see *John of Nassau*
 Malatesta, Pandolfo, bishop of Coutances, 263, 406
 Malengin (Gironde), 366
 Malestroit, Jean de, bishop of Nantes, 217, 290, 363, 364
 Malet, Jean, lord of Granville, 115
 Malines (Antwerp), 361
 Malmesbury (Wilts.), 42
 Mantes (Seine-et-Oise), 168, 176, 177, 194, 216, 240, 333, 353, 408; captured by Burgundians, 79; diplomatic negotiations at, 161, 177, 189 sqq.; Henry at, 164 sq., 189, 190, 191, 193, 200, 325, 326; *bailliage* of, 194, 236, 238, 240, 260, 328, 343; "aide" levied by, 258
 Mantua, 100, 171
 Mapleton, John, 22
 Mar, Alexander Stewart, earl of, 287
 Marbeuf (Eure), 253
 March, Edmund Mortimer, earl of, 10, 63, 109, 110, 112, 193, 267, 269, 275, 338, 380, 395, 406
 Marcoussis (Seine-et-Oise), 353
 Marguerite, daughter of John, duke of Burgundy, 344
 Marie, daughter of Charles VI, 194
 Marigny, Pierre de, 199, 230, 385
 Marmoutier (Indre-et-Loire), abbey of, 80
 Marne, river, 201, 337
 Martin V, pope, 34, 99, 169, 171, 190, 263, 310, 375, 376, 377, 386, 405
 Mascal, Robert, bishop of Hereford, 85
 Masham (Yorks.), 88
 Matilda, empress, daughter of Henry I of England, 111, 119
 Matravers, John Fitzalan, Lord, 36, 58
 Mattersey (Notts.), priory of, 220
 Maubuisson (Seine-et-Oise), abbey of, 179
 Mauny, Olivier de, captain of Falaise, 70 sqq.
 — Olivier de, lord of Thiéville, 342
 Maurepas (Seine-et-Oise), 316
 Meaux (Seine-et-Marne), 211, 232, 258, 261, 293, 294, 330, 353, 358, 359, 363, 373, 378, 381, 387, 389, 393, 402, 403, 406, 411, 414; siege of, 331, 337 sqq.; fall of town, 346 sqq.; siege and capture of market of, 347 sqq.; fate of prisoners from, 350 sqq.; effects of capture of, 356 sq.
 Meaux (Yorks.), abbey of, 220
 Melcombe (Dorset), 402
 Mello (Oise), 357
 Melun (Seine-et-Marne), 169, 218, 330, 446 sqq.; dauphin flees thither, 103; siege of, 210 sqq.; *bailli* of, 232, 378; captain of, 381
 Merbury, John, 92
 — Nicholas, 429
 Mesle, Guillaume le, abbot of St Catherine's, Rouen, 128
 Mesnil, Jean, lord of, 199, 232
 Messas (Loiret), 328
 Metz (Moselle), 31
 Meulan (Seine-et-Oise), 79, 177, 193, 236, 325, 353; conference of, 161 sqq.
 Meung-sur-Loire (Loiret), 329
 Middelburg (Zealand), 46, 402
 Milan, Filippo Maria Visconti, duke of, 358
 Milet, Jean, 199
 Mömpelgard, see *Montbéliard*
 Mons-en-Vimeu (Somme), battle of, 334 sq.
 Montacute (Somerset), 42
 Montagu, Thomas, see *Salisbury, earl of*
 Montaigu (Aisne), castle of, 293, 356
 — Gerard de, bishop of Paris, 233
 Montargis (Loiret), 158, 329
 Montauban, lord of, 217
 Montbéliard (Doubs), 83, 105
 Montbéron, Jacques de, 380, 381
 Montbron (Charente), castle of, 82
 Mont-de-Marsan (Landes), 373
 Montenay, William de, 59
 Montepilloy (Oise), 294
 Montereau (Seine-et-Marne), 83, 102, 165, 185, 197, 208, 229, 329, 365, 381
 Montfaucon (Seine-et-Oise), 352
 Montferrand, David de, archbishop of Bordeaux, 366, 367, 376
 Montfort, Charles de, 317
 Montfort-le-Rotrou (Sarthe), 216
 Montgommery, Jacques d'Harcourt, lord of, see *Tancarville*
 Montguyon (Charente), 371
 Montier-la-Celle (Aube), abbot of, 204

- Montvilliers (Seine-Inf.), 176, 258, 441
 Montjeu, Philibert de, 233
 Montjoie (Seine-et-Oise), 193, 194, 326
 Monthéry (Seine-et-Oise), 79
 Montluel (Ain), castle of, 3
 Montmirail (Sarthe), castle of, 316
 Montoire (Loir-et-Cher), 328
 Montpellier (Hérault), 83
 Montreuil (Pas-de-Calais), 6, 166, 321, 421
 Mont-St-Michel (Manche), 107, 176, 218, 342
 Morgan, Philip, his diplomatic services, 16, 25, 26, 31, 32, 98, 151, 153, 156, 191, 233; chancellor of Normandy, 74, 250; bishop of Worcester, 172, 281, 282, 288, 404
 Mörs, Dietrich von, archbishop of Cologne, 32, 175, 359
 Mortagne (Orne), 66, 365, 413
 Mortain (Manche), 181
 — Edward Holland, count of, 113, 128, 148, 149
 Mortemer (Oise), castle of, 356
 Mortimer, Edmund, see *March, earl of*
 — Hugh, 26
 — John, kt., 45, 394, 395
 Mortlake (Surrey), 41
 Morvilliers, Philippe de, 81, 188, 191, 200, 230, 325, 381, 385, 386, 406
 Moulins-la-Marche (Orne), 413
 Mount Grace (Yorks.), prior of, 284
 Mousseaux (Eure), 253
 Mowbray, John, see *Nottingham, earl of*
 Moy (Aisne), 356, 408
 Murdach, see *Fife, earl of*
 Mustel, Roger, 189
- Nanterre, Simon de, 17
 Nantes (Loire-Inf.), 69; bishop of, see *Malestroit, J. de*
 Naples, kingdom of, 172, 173, 289; queen of, see *Joan*
 Narbonne (Aude), 1, 2, 83, 372
 — Guillaume, viscount of, 294, 295, 341, 409, 413
 Navailles, Archambaud de Foix, lord of, 365
 Navarre, kingdom of, 361; kings of, see *Charles the Bad; Charles III*
 Néhou (Manche), 73
 Nemours (Seine-et-Marne), 329
 Nesle (Somme), 21
 — Guy de, see *Offémont*
 — Louis de, 334, 335, 336
 Netherlands, the, 45, 293, 296, 336, 357
 Netley (Hants.), 42
 Neufchâtel-en-Bray (Seine-Inf.), 176
 Neuville-en-Hez (Oise), 356
- Nevers (Nièvre), 3, 409, 412
 Neville, John, kt., 58, 131
 Newbury (Berks.), 42
 Newcastle-on-Tyne (Northumb.), 88
 Nicholas of Reibnitz, 2
 Nicopolis, 27
 Nîmes (Gard), 83
 Niort (Deux-Sèvres), 150
 Nivernais, 341
 Noblet, Jean, 128
 Nogent l'Artaud (Aisne), 155
 Nogent-le-Roi (Eure-et-Loir), 317, 327, 378
 Nogent-sur-Seine (Aube), 199, 202, 330
 Nördlingen (Bavaria), 174
 Norfolk, county of, 273, 277
 Norham (Northumb.), 90
 Normandy, English invasion of, 53 sqq.; continued conquest of, 107 sqq., 175 sqq., 194; invaded by dauphinists, 311, 313 sqq., 342 sq., 412 sq.; English administration and policy in, 73 sq., 111, 145, 146 sq., 167, 194 sq., 235 sqq., 312, 390, 416; attitude of population, 62 sq., 122, 143 sqq., 195, 261 sqq., 363; discussed in negotiations, 151, 152, 153, 157, 165; position under treaty of Troyes, 199, 235 sq.; *chambre des comptes* of, 74, 194, 244 sq., 247 sqq.; chancery and chancellors of, 74, 242, 250, 380, 406; council of, 194, 246, 249, 250; *Échiquier* of, 194, 247 sqq.; estates of, 237 sq., 250 sq.; lieutenant of, 245 sq., 250; seneschal of, 194, 239, 242, 250; treasury of, 194, 238, 243, 250, 252 sqq.; wolves in, 264
 Norry, Jean de, 150, 152, 153, 159
 Northampton, 42, 86, 270, 273, 285, 436
 Northumberland, county of, 37, 87, 279, 403
 — Henry Percy, 2nd earl of, 36, 51, 89, 90, 91, 269, 275, 396
 Norwich, 272
 Nostell (Yorks.), priory of, 403
 Nottingham, 271, 351
 — John Mowbray, Earl Marshal, earl of, 36, 58, 127, 193, 198, 267
 Nouans (Sarthe), 67
 Nouvion-le-Comte (Aisne), 197
 Noyon, bishop of, see *Coucy, Raoul de*
 Nymegen (Gelderland), 31
- Odon, river, 56
 Offémont, Guy de Nesle, lord of, 333, 336, 346, 357
 Ofort, John, 208
 Oldcastle, Henry, 95
 — Joan, wife of John, 92, 95

- Oldcastle, John, kt., 86 sqq., 395, 404, 428
 Olite, 175
 Orange, John de Chalon, prince of, 82, 105
 — Louis de Chalon, surnamed le Bon, prince of, 82, 213, 344
 Orbec, 111, 262
 Orgemont, Pierre d', 380, 386
 Orkney, bishop of, see *Stephen, W.*
 Orléans, city of (Loiret), 329; forest of, 296
 — Charles, duke of, 1, 6, 21, 39, 40, 41, 190, 417
 Ormonde, James Butler, 4th earl of, 10, 76, 445 sqq.
 — Thomas Butler, 7th earl of, 447
 Orne, river, 56, 58, 59
 Orsini, Giordano, cardinal, 100, 101, 113, 156, 157
 Osney (Oxon.), abbey of, 42
 Ospringe (Kent), 422
 Ostend, George of, 189
 Osterley (Middlesex), 433
 Othe, forest of, 207, 330
 Otto of Ziegenhain, archbishop of Trier, 175
 Oudine or Odette de Champdivers, 80
 Outrede, Ralph, 221
 Oxford, Richard de Vere, earl of, 10, 12, 51
 — University of, 279, 280, 282, 432
 Oxfordshire, 273, 279, 429
 Page, John, 125, 138
 Parc L'Évêque (Manche), 343
 Paris, bishops of, see *Montagu, G de, Courteuaise, J., R chevallée, J. de la*
 — city of, 16, 17, 77, 97, 101, 102, 106, 134, 167, 170, 191, 197, 215, 310, 393, 410, 420; visited by Sigismund, 1, 3 sqq.; threatened by Burgundians, 20, 79, 81; taken by Burgundians, 102 sqq.; threatened by English, 184; in favour of alliance with English, 188, 192 sq., 199 sq.; accepts treaty of Troyes, 204; occupied by English troops, 213; Henry's first visit to, 224 sqq.; sufferings of, 102, 200, 226, 294 sq., 322 sq., 386; disaffection in, 233, 322 sqq., 382, 385, 386 sq., 406 sq., 408; Henry's second visit to, 321 sq., 325; visited by Philip the Good, 343 sqq.; Henry's administration of, 380 sq.; Henry's third visit to, 406 sq.
 — Parlement of, 4, 17, 81, 97, 104, 106, 188, 230, 247, 249, 310, 393; favours alliance with English, 192 sq., 199 sq.; its privileges safeguarded by treaty of Troyes, 199; accepts treaty of Troyes, 204; welcomes Henry V, 224; condemns Montereau murderers, 231; condemns dauphin, 234; Henry's treatment of, 380
 — University of, 4, 198, 229, 431, 433; encourages Rouen, 130 sq.; urges relief of Rouen, 134, 135; favours alliance with English, 192, 199 sq.; accepts treaty of Troyes, 204, 205; welcomes Henry V, 224; promotes condemnation of Montereau murderers, 231; condemns dauphin, 234; protests against taxation, 229, 385; prays for Henry's recovery, 415
 Parliament, English, 12, 417, 433; (Oct. 1416), 30, 36 sq., 42; (Nov. 1417), 91 sqq.; (Oct. 1419), 219 sq.; (Dec. 1420), 265 sq.; (May 1421), 275 sqq., 395; (Dec. 1421), 396 sqq.
 Payne, Thomas, 395, 404
 Pelham, John, kt., 95, 223
 Penthievre, Olivier de Blois, count of, 217, 290, 363, 364
 Perche, county of, 238, 316, 323, 378, 413
 Percival, bastard of Bourbon, 49
 Percy, Henry (Hotspur), 36
 Périgord, 152
 Péronne (Somme), 214, 356, 408
 Perpignan (Pyénées Orientales), 1, 19
 Pestel, Guy, 5
 Petit, Jean, 431
 Pevensey (Sussex), 223, 395
 Peverell, Thomas, bishop of Worcester, 171
 Philip Augustus, king of France, 119, 122
 Philip the Bold, see *Burgundy*
 Philip, William, kt., 258, 259, 339, 390, 391
 Picards, the, 210, 213, 244, 355, 410, 411
 Picardy, 226, 237, 326, 343, 345, 378, 382, 410, 422; supports Burgundian party, 20, 78; visited by Henry, 267, 320 sq.; dauphinist successes in, 295 sq.; campaign of 1421 in, 333 sqq.; Burgundian campaign of 1422 in, 354 sq.; English successes in, 407
 Pickering, John, 41
 Picquigny (Somme), 335
 Pierrefons (Oise), 357
 Pierrepont (Somme), 355
 Plumpton, William, kt., 435
 Plymouth (Devon), 267
 Poissy (Seine-et-Oise), 194, 236
 Poitiers (Vienne), 106, 170, 310, 311
 Poitou, 152, 153, 217, 370
 Pole, Walter de la, kt., 359, 360
 Polton, Thomas, bishop successively of Hereford and Chichester, 172, 173, 405

- Pons (Charente-Inf.), 369
 — lord of, 365
 Pont-Audemer (Eure), 111, 262
 Pont-Aouthou (Eure), 111
 Pont-de-Gennes (Sarthe), 300
 Pont de l'Arche (Eure), 114, 116, 146,
 147, 156, 351
 Pont d'Ouve (Manche), 73
 Pontefract (Yorks.), 87, 271, 351, 403
 Ponthieu, 157, 166, 244, 291, 295, 296
 Pontoise (Seine-et-Oise), 79, 103, 112,
 134, 135, 157, 161, 164, 165, 166, 168,
 169, 177, 178, 179, 184, 193, 200, 236,
 240, 258
 Pontorson (Manche), 73, 180, 181, 246, 289
 Pont Remy (Somme), 6, 333
 Poole, William de la, 399
 Popham, John, kt., 73
 Porée, Martin, bishop of Arras, 172, 189,
 190, 191
 Porter, William, kt., 54, 176, 200 sq.
 Portsdown (Hants.), 48
 Portsmouth (Hants.), 48
 Portugal, kingdom of, 289, 361; king of,
 see *John I*
 Pot, Regnier, 161
 Pouilly (Seine-et-Marne), 169, 177
 Powys, Edward Charlton, lord of, 10, 92,
 95
 Powysland, 92
 Poynings, Robert, Lord, 10
 Prague, 5, 205
 Précý, Jean de, 379, 380
 Pressy, Guiot de, 150
 Prest, John, 85, 404
 Provence, county of, 173
 — Jean Louvet, president of, 189
 Provins (Seine-et-Marne), 141, 146, 158,
 161, 162, 164, 182, 199, 202
 Provisors, statute of, 172, 282, 375, 377,
 405
 Puylagarde (Tarn-et-Garonne), 82
 Puynormand (Gironde), 366

 Quesnoy-sur-Airaines (Somme), 354
 Quévilly (Seine-Inf.), 129
 Quillebeuf (Eure), 129, 130

 Radcliffe, John, kt., 73, 313, 367, 400
 Railstone, Robert Stewart of, 302
 Rambouillet (Seine-et-Oise), 278
 Raolin, Nicholas, 166, 230
 Raoulet, Jean, 334, 335
 Rapiout, Jean, 166
 Reading (Berks.), 42, 47, 68, 86
 Redesdale (Northumb.), 280
 Reggio, 173
 Regnéville (Manche), 260

 Reibnitz, Nicholas of, 2
 Remy (Oise), 356
 René of Anjou, 174
 Rennes (Ille-et-Vilaine), 75, 363
 Repingdon, Philip, bishop of Lincoln, 42
 Reynald, John, 404
 Rhuddlan (Flint), 351
 Richard II, king of England, 87, 90, 93,
 95
 Richemont, Arthur of Brittany, count of,
 39, 217 sq., 238, 244, 339, 342, 344, 363,
 406
 Rieux, Jean de, marshal of France, 216
 Rinel, Jean de, 199
 Rions (Gironde), 368
 Risle, river, 111
 Rivière, Perette de la, 177
 Robsart, John, kt., 110, 139, 395
 — Lewis, kt., 176, 198, 200, 291, 416
 Roche (Yorks.), abbey of, 403
 Rochefort (Charente-Inf.), 369
 Rochester (Kent), 10, 422; bishops of, see
Kemp, J.; *Langdon, J.*; *Spofford, T.*;
Yonge, R.
 Rochetaillée, Jean de la, patriarch of Con-
 stantinople, 387
 Rochford, Ralph, 16, 24, 41
 Rome, 310, 375, 376, 404
 Roos, John, Lord, of Hamlake, 194, 198,
 200, 301, 305
 Rotherhithe, 222, 223
 Rotterdam, 46
 Rouen (Seine-Inf.), 2, 24, 116, 158, 172,
 200, 234, 238, 254, 266, 287, 312, 322,
 351, 358, 372, 386, 403, 406, 421, 446,
 448; favours Burgundian party, 121,
 122; visited by dauphin, 54, 121; siege
 of, 117, 123 sq., 148 sq.; topography
 of, 118 sq.; history of, 120 sq., 122;
 attempts to relieve, 134 sq.; capitula-
 tion of, 137 sq.; under English rule,
 143, 146 sq., 180, 194, 237, 242, 249,
 258, 259; new palace at, 147 sq.; peace
 negotiations at, 161, 191 sq.; *balliage*
 of, 141, 238, 240, 260; mint of, 256,
 259, 390
 — archbishop of, see *Harcourt, Louis d'*
 Rouergue, 152
 Rougemont (Loiret), castle of, 330, 333
 Rouvres, Jean de, 350, 351, 352
 Roxburgh (Berwicksh.), 88 sq.
 Roye (Somme), 196, 197, 295
 Rufford (Notts.), abbey of, 220
 Ruislip (Middlesex), 432
 Rutel (Seine-et-Marne), castle of, 339
 Rutland, 36

 Sablé (Sarthe), 311; treaty of, 290, 363

- Saintonge, 152, 153, 217, 365, 370
 Saintrailles, Poton de, 333, 334, 335, 354
 Salisbury (Wilts.), 42, 47, 396
 — Thomas Montagu, count of Perche, earl of, 27, 44, 54, 113, 151, 175, 225, 259, 260, 278 sq., 280, 312, 343; at siege of Caen, 58; at siege of Falaise, 70; at siege of Rouen, 127 sq., 139; takes Honfleur, 176; lieutenant of Normandy, 180, 245; conducts operations in Maine, 216; count of Perche, 238; conducts retreat after Baugé, 301, 304, 306 sqq.; attempts relief of Alençon, 313 sq.; raids Maine and Anjou, 314; estimate of his services in 1421, 314; recaptures Meulan, 353
 Salvart, Jeanson, 148
 Sancerre (Cher), 409
 Sandwich (Kent), 9, 21, 22, 36, 42, 318
 Santa Croce, abbey of, Rome, 376
 Sarthe, river, 309
 Saumur (Maine-et-Loire), 311
 Saveuse, Hector de, 196
 Savigny, Lourdin, lord of, 199
 Savoisy, Henri de, archbishop of Sens, 152, 164, 206
 Savoy, 79
 — Amédée VIII, duke of, 3, 287, 374, 375, 409
 Scales, Thomas, Lord, 339, 343
 Scotland, 45, 87, 89 sqq., 181, 183, 266, 278, 286, 294, 358 sq.
 Scots, the, in France, 181, 183, 210, 216, 266, 294, 297 sqq., 310, 316, 360
 Scottish border, the, 87, 89 sqq., 274
 Scrope, Henry, Lord, of Masham, 12, 86, 89
 — Richard, archbishop of York, 434 sqq.
 — Richard, Lord, of Bolton, 113
 — Stephen, archdeacon of Richmond, 89
 Seaford (Sussex), 342
 Sées (Orne), 65, 181, 254
 — John, bishop of, 263
 Segneult, Jean, 123, 143, 144
 Segovia (Castile), 181
 Seignet, Guillaume, lord of Vacluse, 5, 41, 159
 — Jean, 189
 Seine, river, 18, 114, 159, 162, 209, 236, 240, 293, 325, 330, 415
 Selby (Yorks.), abbey of, 220, 403
 Selkirk, 90
 Selles (Loir-et-Cher), 294
 Sengleton, John, 282
 Senlis (Oise), 78, 79, 81, 227, 236, 377, 378, 386, 408, 414, 415, 416
 Senonches (Eure-et-Loir), 378
 Sens (Yonne), 208, 294, 378; archbishop of, see *Savoisy, H. de*
 Severac, Amaury de, 342, 409
 Sézanne (Marne), 204
 Shaftesbury (Dorset), 42
 Shipton Moor (Yorks.), 434
 Shirley, Walter, 396
 Shrewsbury (Salop), 223, 270
 Sigismund, king of the Romans, commonly called emperor, journey to Perpignan, 1; journey and visit to Paris, 2 sqq.; proceeds to England, 6 sqq.; his reception, 9 sqq., 446, 447; admitted to Order of the Garter, 12 sqq.; attempts mediation, 14 sqq.; his failure, 17 sqq.; signs treaty of Canterbury, 18 sq.; leaves, 21; takes part in conference at Calais, 22, 24 sqq.; his journey to Constance, 30 sq.; results and purpose of his actions, 32 sq.; his sword, 35; Henry's later dealings with, 40, 84, 174, 359 sqq.; relations with Burgundy, 34, 83, 188; his part in election of Martin V, 99; accepts treaty of Troyes, 205
 Skrene, William, 36
 Sluys (Zealand), 402
 Smallhythe (Kent), 21
 Soissons (Aisne), 135, 168, 334
 Somerset, county of, 395
 Somerset, John, 432
 — John Beaufort, earl of, 301, 306
 Somme, river, 151, 162, 294, 296, 333, 353
 Sours (Eure-et-Loir), 317, 325
 Southampton (Hants.), 12, 16, 42, 44, 46, 47, 48, 68, 86, 89, 182, 266, 275, 373, 395, 401, 402
 Southwark (Surrey), 10
 Southwick (Hants.), 42, 99, 402
 Spofford, Thomas, successively abbot of St Mary's, York, and bishop of Rochester and of Hereford, 100, 405
 Springhouse, Edmund, kt., 59
 St Albans (Herts.), 41, 86, 270; abbot of, see *Whethamstede, J.*
 St Antoine, Bastille of, see *Bastille*
 St Bazeille (Lot-et-Garonne), 371
 — Francis, lord of, 238, 372
 St Catherine, abbey of, Rouen, 127 sq., 129, 157, 161
 St Clare, John, 287
 St Cloud (Seine-et-Oise), 79
 St Denis (Seine), 6, 21, 103, 134, 178, 184, 201, 407, 420
 — chronicle of, partly ascribed to J. Chartier, 297, 424
 — de Moronval (Eure-et-Loir), 326
 St Dizier (Haute-Marne), 409

- St Dye-sur-Loire (Loir-et-Cher), 328,
329
St Émilien (Gironde), 366, 367, 371
St Faro, abbey of, Meaux, 338, 339, 344,
356, 373, 414
St Fiacre, 418 sq.
St George de Boscherville, abbot of, 139
St Germain-en-Laye (Seine-et-Oise), 193,
194, 236
St Jean d'Angély (Charente-Inf.), 82, 370
St John, John, mayor of Bordeaux, 368,
370, 371
St Josse, abbey of (Pas-de-Calais), 6
St Lô (Manche), 63, 73, 195, 256, 343
St Loup, abbot of, 204
St Macaire (Gironde), 368
St Martin, abbey of, Pontoise, 179
St Martin-ès-Aires, abbot of, 204
St Martin-le-Gaillard (Seine-Inf.), 180
St Maur-des-Fossés (Seine), 106, 420
St Omer (Pas-de-Calais), 27
St Paul's Cathedral, London, 11, 47, 205,
393, 422
St Pierre-Église (Manche), 244
St Pierre sur Dives (Calvados), 65
St Pol (Pas-de-Calais), 267
— Philip of Burgundy, count of, 165,
189, 190, 213, 226
St Quentin (Aisne), 197, 198, 357
St Riquier (Somme), 6, 321, 333, 334,
335
St Sauveur-le-Vicomte (Manche), 73
St Sever (Landes), 45, 371
— (Seine-Inf.), 119
St Stephen, abbey of, Caen, 57 sqq.
St Thomas' Watering, near London, 10,
422
St Vaast (Manche), 63
St Valéry-sur-Somme (Somme), 53, 296,
335, 353, 357, 407, 412
Stafford, Anne, countess of, 280
— Humphrey, earl of, 269
— John, 161, 271, 288
Staffordshire, 396
Staple, statute of the, 220, 277
Stephen, William, bishop of Orkney, 182
Stephens, Thomas, 41
Stewart of Darnley, John, 311
Stokes, John, 151, 156, 175, 359
Stone, John, warden of King's Hall,
Cambridge, 436
Stonesfield (Oxon.), 429
Stopyndon, John, 242
Strangways, John, 36
Strasbourg (Bas-Rhin), 31
Suffolk, county of, 273, 277
— William de la Pole, earl of, 13, 131,
180, 246, 260, 329, 343, 363, 433
Talbot, Gilbert, Lord, 22, 51, 58, 63, 72,
73, 129, 148, 149, 219
— John, Lord, 72
Tancarville (Seine-Inf.), 176
— Jacques d'Harcourt, lord of Mont-
gommery, count of, 295, 296, 320 sq.,
333 sqq., 353, 354, 407, 412
— John Grey of Heton, count of, 74,
151, 161, 176, 301, 305
Taylor, William, 281
Tenterden (Kent), 404
Teramo, Simon de, 375
Teutonic Order, 45
Teviotdale, 90
Tewkesbury abbey (Gloucestersh.), 348
Thame (Oxon.), 42
Thérouanne (Pas-de-Calais), 267; bishop
of, see *Luxemburg, Louis of*
Thian, Jean, Bastard of, 317
Thiérache, 20, 334, 354
Thiéville, Olivier de Maunoy, lord of, 342
Thoulangeon, John, lord of, 189
Thurgarton (Notts.), priory of, 403
Thury-Harcourt (Calvados), 64, 261
Tichbourne Down (Hants.), 48
Tillières (Eure), 327
Tilly-sur-Seulles (Calvados), 64
Tiptoft, John, kt., 30, 31, 32, 33, 40, 74,
239, 248, 250, 368 sqq., 376
Tirwhit, William, kt., 238
Titchfield (Hants.), 47
Tombelaine (Manche), 218
Tonnerre, see *Chalon*
Torigny (Manche), 73
Toulouse (Haute-Garonne), 83
Touques (Calvados), 54, 195, 254; river,
53, 111
Touraine, 154, 165, 183, 325
Tournay (Flanders), 81, 362
Tours (Indre-et-Loire), 80, 299, 310, 311;
archbishop of, see *Gelu, J.*
Tower of London, the, 39, 41, 88, 93,
95, 343, 351, 394, 395, 397, 402, 403;
mint of, 277, 402 sq., 433
Tremblay (Seine-et-Oise), 196
Trie (Oise), castle of, 193
Triet, archbishop of, see *Otto of Ziegen-
hain*
Trouville (Calvados), 53
Troyes (Aube), 78, 81, 83, 100, 105, 123,
162, 184, 187, 192, 197, 199, 200, 201,
202 sqq., 207, 295, 345, 378, 385, 409,
410, 411, 415
— treaty of, terms, 198 sq., 203 sq.,
235 sq., 309, 310, 351, 372; accepted
in Paris, 205; proclaimed in London,
205; accepted by States-General, 227;
accepted by Estates of Normandy, 237;

- Troyes, treaty of (*contd.*)
 ratified by English Parliament, 276,
 281; Norman resistance to, 263; ac-
 cepted by French prisoners, 286 sq.,
 357; Burgundian dislike of, 295,
 344 sq., 361 sqq.; accepted by duke of
 Brittany, 364; Henry's views on, 374,
 416
- Trun (Calvados), 65
- Tudert, Jean, dean of Paris, 159
- Tully (Somme), 237
- Turks, the, 5, 7
- Tynedale (Northumb.), 280
- Ulm (Württemberg), 99
- Umfraville, Gilbert, kt., 51, 58, 63, 65,
 113, 116, 126, 137, 138, 189, 198, 200,
 302, 306
- Robert, kt., 89, 90
- Urban de Florencia, 376
- Usflete, Gerard, kt., 110
- Vailly, Jean de, 159
- Valée, Robert de, abbot of Bec, 112
- Valenciennes (Nord), 291, 292
- Valfin, Jean de la Baume-Montrevel, lord
 of, 381
- Valognes (Manche), 73, 111, 231
- Valois, 293, 334, 357, 378
- Vannes, Amaury de la Motte, bishop of,
 364
- Vasques of Almada, João de, 139
- Vaughan, Sir Griffith, lord of Burgedin,
 93
- Vaugirard (Seine-et-Oise), 79
- Vaurus, Bastard of, 338, 350, 352
- Denis de, 350, 352
- Vendôme (Loir-et-Cher), 325, 328, 370,
 378
- Louis, count of, 39
- Venice, 46, 100
- Verduisant, lord of, 353
- Vergy, Antoine de, 380, 381, 409
- Jean de, 161, 409
- Vermandois, 81, 232, 326, 354, 378, 407
- Verneuil (Eure), 66, 240, 246, 413
- Vernon (Eure), 160, 161, 162, 163, 176, 194
- Versailles (Seine-et-Oise), 79
- Vertus, Philip of Orléans, count of, 365
- Vexin, the, 180, 184
- Vézelay (Yonne), 410
- Viell Baugé (Maine-et-Loire), 300, 303,
 304, 306
- Viell Hesdin (Pas-de-Calais), 432
- Villebon (Eure-et-Loir), 316
- Villeneuve l'Archevêque (Yonne), 207
- Villeneuve-sur-Yonne (Yonne), 294, 295,
 322, 329, 330, 333
- Villers-Bocage (Calvados), 64
- Vimeu, 260, 296, 333, 353, 354, 357, 407,
 408
- Vire (Calvados), 73, 258
- Wailli, Jean de, 97
- Wales, 85 sq., 92, 93
- Walker, Richard, 221
- Walkstede, Richard, kt., 238
- Wallingford (Berks.), 42, 429
- Wallopforth (Hants.), 48
- Walsingham (Norfolk), 272
- Waltham, Roger, 245
- Wantage (Berks.), 42
- Ware, Henry, keeper of the privy seal,
 25, 27, 41; bishop of Chichester, 159
- Warkworth (Northumb.), 89
- Warwick, Richard Beauchamp, count of
 Aumale, earl of, 14, 27, 97, 147, 225,
 267, 275, 417; welcomes Sigismund at
 Calais, 7; treats with Burgundy, 20,
 83, 156, 161, 162, 191; at siege of Caen,
 58, 60; besieges Domfront, 107; be-
 sieges Caudebec, 129; at siege of Rouen,
 131, 137, 139; at conference of Meulan,
 164, 168; besieges La Roche Guyon,
 176 sq.; as envoy in Paris, 193; at
 Troyes, 198, 200 sq.; at siege of Melun,
 210; at queen's coronation, 269; at
 siege of Meaux, 338 sq., 347, 349;
 commands in Picardy, 407, 412; at
 Henry's deathbed, 416
- Waterton, Robert, 16, 24, 27, 351
- Watton (Yorks.), priory of, 220
- Webb, Henry, 404
- Wells (Somerset), 42
- Welshpool (Montgomerysh.), 92
- Wenzel, king of the Romans, 34
- Weobley (Herefordsh.), 270
- Westminster, 11, 36, 39, 47, 88, 219, 267,
 268 sq., 286, 359, 370, 395, 422
- abbey of, 268, 283, 422 sq., 427
- Westmorland, county of, 37, 279, 396, 403
- Ralph Neville, earl of, 88, 90, 91, 269,
 275, 435
- Whethamstede, John, abbot of St Albans,
 284
- White, William, 404
- Whittington, Richard, 434
- Whittington, Robert, 88
- Whorlton (Yorks.), 36
- Wigtown, Archibald Douglas, earl of,
 183, 294, 300, 316, 307
- Willoughby, Robert, Lord, 58, 401, 411
- Wilton (Wilts.), 396
- Wiltshire, 273
- Winchelsea (Sussex), 401
- Windecke, Eberhardt, 2, 30

- Windsor (Berks.), 12, 39, 42, 393, 395
 Witney (Oxon.), 42
 Wittelsbach, family of, 359
 Woburn (Beds.), 42
 Woodnesburgh, John, prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, 22
 Woodstock (Oxon.), 429
 Woodville, Richard, 238, 243
 Woolmer (Hants.), 429
 Worcester, 404; bishops of, see *Morgan, P.*; *Peverell, T.*; cathedral of, 221; diocese of, 221; prior of, 284
 — Richard Beauchamp, earl of, previously Lord Abergavenny, 10, 131, 269, 275, 348
 Worcester, Richard, 315
 Wyche, Richard, 89, 221
 Yarmouth (Norfolk), 402
 Yolande, duchess of Anjou, see *Anjou*
 Yonge, Richard, bishop of Rochester, 172
 Yonne, river, 209, 293, 295, 330
 York, 35, 220, 271, 286, 435 sq.
 — Philippa, duchess of, 430
 Yorkshire, 87, 272, 318
 Ypres (West Flanders), 34
 Zealand, see *Holland*
 Zizka, John, 360

DA Wylie, James Hamilton
256 The reign of Henry the
W8 Fifth
v.3

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

